



Halkoaho Tuomas

“Teaching global English?” Perceptions and experiences of Finnish English teachers about
English as a lingua franca in the Finnish school context

Master's Thesis
KASVATUSTIETEIDEN TIEDEKUNTA
Intercultural Teacher Education
2020

Oulun yliopisto

Kasvatustieteiden tiedekunta

”Teaching global English?” Perceptions and experiences of Finnish English teachers about English as a lingua franca in the Finnish school context (Tuomas Halkoaho)

Maisterin tutkielma, 91 sivua

Joulukuu 2020

Englanti on tärkeä kommunikaatiokieli modernissa globaalissa maailmassa. Tämä on johtanut ilmiöön, jossa ihmiset kommunikoivat keskenään englanniksi ympäri maailmaa riippumatta heidän kielitaustoistaan. Tätä ilmiötä kutsutaan nimellä englanti lingua francana, tai globaali englanti mikä tarkoittaa Englannin kielellä kommunikointia toisen ihmisen kanssa, kun puhujilla ei ole yhteistä kieltä. Tämän lingvistiikan alan nousu on johtanut väittelyyn koulutuksen maailmassa, pitäisikö englantia lingua francana (ELF) opettaa perinteisen vieraan englannin kielen (EFL) sijasta. Monet maat kulkevat edelleen standardin EFL-opetuksen mukaan. Sillä välin uusi Suomen perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelma on sisällyttänyt näkemyksiä englannin kielen oppimistavoitteisiin, jotka voisi tulkita ELF-positiivisiksi näkemyksiksi. Tämä johtaa tämän tutkielman aiheeseen, joka on suomalaisten englannin opettajien näkemykset ja kokemukset ELF-ilmiöstä ja siitä, kuinka he näkevät sen koulun kontekstissa. Kvalitatiivinen tutkimus toteutettiin fenomenografian näkökulmiin perustuen. Tämä tarkoittaa osallistujien näkemyksien ja kokemusten tutkimista. Temaattinen analyysi valittiin analysointitavaksi tukemaan muita metodologioita.

Analyysin tuloksena löytyi yhteensä yhdeksän erilaista teemaa, jotka jaettiin kahteen eri kategoriaan: pääteemat ja pienteemat. Löytyneet pääteemat jakautuivat näihin näkemyksiin ja kokemuksiin: 1) globaali englanti ilmiönä 2) globaalin englannin positiiviset vaikutukset koulussa 3) globaalin englannin negatiiviset vaikutukset koulussa, ja 4) englannin kehitys tulevaisuudessa. Viisi pienteemaa loivat näkemyksiä ja kokemuksia seuraavista: 1) globaali Englanti työkaluna 2) globaalin englannin opettaminen 3) tietoisuus ja itsevarmuus globaalissa Englannissa 4) globaali englanti olemassa olevissa opetusmateriaaleissa, ja 5) oppilaat ja heidän englannin kielen käyttö. Teemat kuvasivat opettajien olevan sekä tietoisia että osaavia ELF-ilmiön käyttäjiä. He ovat myös halukkaita käyttämään erilaisia ELF-metodeja opetuksessaan. Tulokset näyttivät, että opettajat yleensä huolehtivat lisääntyneestä eriyttämisestä ja yleisesti vastustavat täyttä vaihtoa ELF-opetukseen vaan sen sijaan yhdistäisivät perinteisiä ja moderneja ELF-metodeja. Opettajat olivat myös tietoisia erilaisista opetusmateriaaleista, mutta näkemykset materiaalien sopivuudesta olivat jakaantuneita. Opettajat olivat myös tietoisia oppilaiden englannin kielen käytöstä koulun ulkopuolella ja sen mahdollisista hyvistä ja huonoista vaikutuksista. Englannin kielen tulevaisuus oli tulosten mukaan valoisa. Kielen vaikutus tulisi kasvamaan joko muiden kielten kanssa, tai jopa niiden kustannuksella. Myös Englannin kielen käyttö kommunikaatiossa ja opetuksessa tulisi siirtymään ELF-orientoituneeseen suuntaan. Tulosten perusteella lisää tutkimuksia tarvitaan kielenkäytön eri konteksteista sekä englannin oppikirjoista ja oppilaiden näkemyksistä.

Avainsanat: englannin kieli, Maailman englannit, englanti lingua francana, globaali Englanti, suomalaiset opettajat

University of Oulu

Faculty of Education

“Teaching global English?” Perceptions and experiences of Finnish English teachers about English as a lingua franca in the Finnish school context (Tuomas Halkoaho)

Master’s thesis, 91 pages,

December 2020

English is an important language of communication in the modern global world. This has led to the phenomenon of people communication with each other in English all around the world regardless of their linguistic background. This phenomenon is called English as a lingua franca, or global English, which means using English to communicate with another person when you do not share the same language. The emergence of this field of linguistics has led to a debate in the educational field, whether English as a lingua franca (ELF) should be taught instead of the traditional English as a foreign language (EFL). Many countries still abide by the more standard way of EFL teaching. Meanwhile, the new Finnish core curriculum has implemented perspectives to its learning goals in English that could be interpreted as ELF positive. This leads to the topic of this thesis, which is the perceptions and experiences of Finnish English teachers about the phenomenon of ELF and how do they view it in the context of school. A qualitative study was conducted with the perspectives of phenomenography. This means investigating the perceptions and experiences of the participants. A thematic analysis was chosen as the method of analysis to complement these other methodologies. The results of the study found a total of nine different themes which were divided into two categories: primary themes and secondary themes. The primary themes found were perceptions and experiences of following topics: 1) global English as a phenomenon 2) positive impacts of global English in school 3) negative impacts of global English in school, and 4) development of English in the future. The five secondary themes were perceptions and experiences of: 1) global English as a tool 2) teaching global English 3) awareness and confidence in global English 4) global English in existing teaching materials, and 5) pupils and their English use. These themes described that Finnish English teachers are aware and knowledgeable of the ELF phenomenon and are willing to use the different methods of ELF in their teaching. The results showed that teachers generally worry about the increased need of differentiation and are generally against completely switching to ELF-based teaching and would instead combine traditional and modern ELF methods. Teachers were also aware of different teaching materials but were divided on their perceptions on their suitability for ELF-teaching. Teachers were also found to be aware of the pupils’ use of English outside of the school and the possible positive and negative impacts of that. The future of English was found to be bright, its influence growing with or even despite other languages and that both English communication and teaching would move towards a more ELF-oriented communication. From these results, more research on the different contexts of language use is called for and topics like English coursebooks and perceptions of pupils should also be investigated.

Keywords: English, World Englishes, English as a lingua franca, global English, Finnish teachers

Contents

1	Introduction	6
1.1	Background.....	6
1.2	Aim of thesis and research questions.....	7
2	Theoretical framework.....	9
2.1	World Englishes.....	9
2.2	English as a lingua franca	11
2.3	English as a lingua franca in education.....	17
2.3.1	<i>ELF versus EFL</i>	18
2.3.2	<i>ELF awareness and student confidence</i>	21
2.3.3	<i>ELF in teaching</i>	24
2.4	English teaching and use in Finland	29
2.4.1	<i>The core curriculum</i>	30
2.4.2	<i>Finnish contexts of English use in school</i>	32
2.4.3	<i>Finnish contexts of English use outside of school</i>	38
3	Methodology.....	41
3.1	Qualitative research	41
3.2	Phenomenography	41
4	Research	43
4.1	Participants	43
4.2	Data collection	45
4.3	Method of analysis.....	47
5	Results.....	50
5.1	Primary themes	50
5.1.1	<i>Perceptions and experiences on global English as a phenomenon</i>	51
5.1.2	<i>Perceptions and experiences about positive impacts of global English in school</i>	55
5.1.3	<i>Perceptions and experiences of the negatives of global English in school</i>	58
5.1.4	<i>Perceptions on the development of English in the future</i>	61
5.2	Secondary themes	64
5.2.1	<i>Perceptions and experiences of global English as a tool</i>	64
5.2.2	<i>Perceptions and experiences on teaching global English</i>	66
5.2.3	<i>Perceptions and experiences of awareness in global English</i>	68
5.2.4	<i>Perceptions of global English in existing teaching material</i>	70
5.2.5	<i>Perceptions on pupils and their English use</i>	72
6	Discussion	76
6.1	Implications of the results.....	76

6.2	Reliability	81
6.3	Conclusions	82
References.....		86

1 Introduction

English has been one of the most important languages of the world for many decades now. It has spread nearly everywhere in some shape or form. English use has spread into many ways of life, such as cultures, values, entertainment, business, and academia (Hult, 2017). This means that English is a part of nearly every field of life. A student will learn English in school in most countries in the world, a businessman or woman will converse in English at some point in their life with other business owners, any person can go and watch a Hollywood movie or watch shows on TV or their streaming service of choice. The spread of English language has become so large, that it is spoken in many countries in many ways.

1.1 Background

The spread of English has led to the developments of ideas of English as a global language or a lingua franca (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). A very appropriate definition of English as a Lingua Franca was devised by Widdowson: *“the communicative use of linguistic resources, by native as well as non-native speakers of English, when no other shared means of communication are available or appropriate”* (2012, p 190). This view of the English language has become more and more noticed and researched by known researchers like Jenkins (2009; 2012) and Seidlhofer (2011). English as a lingua franca has grown from a minor field in applied linguistics into a major field of study itself (Jenkins, 2012). The research of English as a Lingua Franca is important, since most people who speak English today are not native speakers at all. In 2009 already, 80% of English speakers were not native, and only 10% were native (Jenkins, 2009). This has since of course increased significantly in the modern age of globalization.

The problem is that even with the reality of English being a very global language used by many different people around the world, the perceptions, and ideas on how English should be used or taught in school have largely not changed. Many people still have the belief that English as a Lingua Franca is a variety that is “incorrect” when it is a legitimate way to use English by itself, and an inevitable development in the globalization of the English language (Seidlhofer, 2011). Research has shown that even when teachers are aware of English as a lingua franca, they still use the norms they are used to (Deniz, Özkan & Bayyurt, 2016). There is also a lot of insecurity among pupils and users of English as well due to not meeting the goals of “native-level” speech and linguistic achievements. Anxiety in speaking English and achievement have

been found to be linked and that speaking in front of other people, fears of making grammatical mistakes, pronunciation, and inability to speak spontaneously were the largest worries in students' language skills (Awan et al, 2010).

This is also my personal motivation for this thesis. I am also an English teacher myself and have been very interested in this specific topic for a long time now. When I learned of this area of applied linguistics, I immediately wanted to learn more and have taken multiple courses on this topic during my master's studies and that is also one of the reasons I chose it as the topic for this thesis. However, there are also reasons that come from my personal experiences with people and using English. In my personal life I have also noticed that many people with very good English skills in the global scale feel inferiority in their own language skills and makes them actively avoid situations where they have to speak English in public. When discussing with them, I have usually found that these thoughts originate from their time in school and the experience they have had there. They have felt that the goal for English learning has been the "native" level and that since they have not achieved it, their English skills are poor. This does not fit the phenomenon of English as a lingua franca, which believes that the "native" level of English is often unachievable by English learners and aiming for it creates false expectations and feelings of inferiority (Kiczowiak & Lowe, 2019). Therefore, in my thesis I will be studying what kind of perceptions and experience teachers in Finland have from the phenomenon of English as a lingua franca in general and in their working context, the school. Teachers were chosen as the subject of study due to their role in providing language education to a large portion of the population, and as previously mentioned, teacher perceptions and actions have seen to influence the kind of language they teach in their classrooms.

1.2 Aim of thesis and research questions

The aim of this thesis is to find out what kind of perceptions teachers have about English as a lingua franca and how do they use it in their teaching, if at all. The reasons for them using or not using English as a lingua franca in their teaching is also a subject of investigation. From this study I hope to shed light on the current ideas and experiences teachers have on the phenomenon so that more research can be done from the outcomes of this research. I hope to find out what positive aspects teachers can see in English as a lingua franca, how they use it in their teaching, what problems there may be in using it and how do they see the position of English in the future. These are important topics to investigate, because knowing the perceptions and

experiences of teachers can show us how to make our education field better for both the teachers and students of all ages alike. From teacher's experiences we could find problems in current language teaching, what works in our current teaching and how teachers feel in general about the current atmosphere of language teaching. This study will be conducted as a qualitative phenomenography, meaning it will investigate the perceptions and experiences of teachers, as previously has been discussed. There are two questions I aim to answer in this study:

1. How do English teachers in Finland perceive and/or experience English as a global language as a phenomenon in general and in the context of school?
2. How do teachers perceive the future of English as a global language and how the role of English will change?

The first research question is the main subject of study in this thesis. This question aims to discover the different experiences and perceptions of Finnish English teachers. The second question aims to find out the future perceptions of the phenomenon that teachers have. With the new curriculum having been taken into effect since 2016, investigating the perceptions of teachers in this new age of teaching is also very relevant (Opetushallitus, 2014). Since the world is becoming more and more globalized, it is important for us to be aware of the changes in the uses of English around the world and teachers are the key in implementing that change. Without teachers this society would not function, so knowing what they think is very important for everyone so that we can continue to have quality teaching in the coming years as well.

2 Theoretical framework

Living in this globalising world of today, English has grown to be a very important language in many different fields, such as business, entertainment, science, education and more. English has therefore become a global language, or a lingua franca. This means that it has become widespread and exists in nearly every country in the world in one way or another (Crystal, 2003). The study of English as a lingua franca (from here on, ELF) has developed in many ways ever since the latter half of the 20th century. One of the first major theories relating to ELF was developed by Kachru, called the Three Circles of English in what has been later called ‘‘the theory of World Englishes’’ (Kachru, 1985). Later, many different linguists and researchers have continued to develop the study of ELF, going from developing a core system for ELF, to investigating it more from the point of view of the user (Jenkins, 2000; Kiczkowski & Lowe, 2019). ELF has also been studied a lot in terms of education, and how ELF could be used in English teaching (eg. Seidlhofer & Widdowson, 2018). In this theory section I will be discussing English as a lingua franca as a phenomenon and how it has developed through the years, first discussing World Englishes, then more modern views of ELF. Then I will discuss the use of ELF in education and what different viewpoints and ideas are related to that and how teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) interacts with ELF in different contexts and situations. Finally, I will discuss English teaching in Finland and how ELF fits into the Finnish context of English teaching in terms of the new curriculum and research on the topic.

2.1 World Englishes

English as a language has its roots deep in the history of the world. According to King (2006a), it is difficult to pinpoint the exact location where the English language was born. He says that the Germanic-family of Indo-European languages, in which English belongs to, originates from Eastern Europe in modern Ukraine from where they began migrating north, east and west approximately 3000 BC. From there on the language developed until in the Middle ages the Anglo-Saxons spoke what could be called ‘‘old English’’ (King, 2006a). The first spread of English from the Middle age England was to Wales and Ireland (King, 2006b). From there on English would spread across the globe through colonization to countries like Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and The United States (Schneider, 2006). This global spread to different countries rose to attention and as a focus of research in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Fang,

2017). This led to a pioneer on the subject, Kachru, to develop the theory called ‘‘World Englishes’’ in 1985. This theory challenged the previous notions on codes, standards, models, and methods that had to do with the English language and in his exploration, he developed a model that is comprised of three concentric circles, called ‘‘The Three Circles of English’’ (Kachru, 1985). In this Kachru’s World Englishes (WE) paradigm, these three circles were divided into ‘‘The Inner Circle’’, ‘‘The Outer Circle’’ and ‘‘The Expanding Circle’’. The Inner Circle speakers are the native speakers of the language, including countries like The United States, The United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The Outer circle describes countries where English has an official status, such as India, Singapore, and Nigeria for example. The Expanding Circle includes the countries where English is spoken as a foreign language. Countries like Finland, Sweden, Japan, Poland etc. belong to this category according to the WE paradigm. These are the basis of the WE theory and from which a lot of future research on the topic has been conducted. In this paradigm it is seen that the people of the Expanding circle are no longer just languages learners but users of language, due to the changes in the world to a more global direction where non-native speakers use English to communicate with each other (Fang, 2017). The WE paradigm is also called the Kachruvian paradigm, referring to the name of the creator.

In terms of the reasons why the term ‘‘World Englishes’’ pluralises the word English has to do with the nature in which English is seen from the point of view of WEs. According to Kachru, (2006) the varieties of underlying theoretical, pragmatic, and methodological aspects of English make the pluralization of English necessary, becoming Englishes. WEs consists of language as a medium and language as a message, medium referring to the form of the language (phonology, morphology, syntax) while the message embodies the functions in which medium is then used (Kachru, 2006). Kachru (2006) continues that English is international in the diverse, cross-cultural way in that English is used everywhere in the world in different cultures and communities of speech. When discussing English with terms like global, international, or universal, homogeneity and uniformity is not being discussed, rather messages are given to be learned, acquired, absorbed, and appreciated in the correct cultural contexts (Kachru, 2006).

WEs has been researched in many ways over the years. Discussing the media and WEs and the power of the English language and its ideologies was done by Martin (2006), saying for example that certain groups in movies speak in a different way and that these people are often seen as inferior or powerless in said movies. Bhatia (2006) has discussed advertising on a global scale. In this research it was found that globally, other Englishes than Inner Circle Englishes

were used in adverts. Language mixing with English and the native language was found to be an unwritten rule in advertising and finally cross-cultural translation and intelligibility was found as a feature of globalization and in terms of appropriateness and acceptance of WEs these terms were found to be relevant in the field of WEs (Bhatia, 2006). Research on gender identities when discussing WEs has also been done by Valentine (2006). In terms of teaching, WE methodology was found to have a sound base for ecological language education and that is attentive to the role that shifts in context bring to language education (Brown, 2006). According to Brown (2006) the role of context must be taken into consideration in teacher preparatory programmes.

The background of research on the global language of English is deeply rooted in the paradigm of WEs. This paradigm has since been mostly replaced by the more communication-oriented English as a lingua franca, which will be discussed in more detail in the next sections. However, some researchers have stayed with the WE paradigm even when it was not as popular anymore. Yamuna Kachru and Smith (2008) for example preferred the WE paradigm due to the English as a lingua franca paradigm not capturing the phenomenon of WEs in the same way. They saw the term global English that is used in the English as a lingua franca paradigm as a variety, and according to them such a variety does not exist, and it changes the focus into certain aspects at the cost of understanding the large phenomenon. As an example, Kachru and Smith (2008) discuss Euro English variations meaning European English variations, that have internal variations in themselves and these variations do not make them any less legitimate. There are also languages in the world with no set grammar or codification, meaning that codification is not necessary for a language to exist (Kachru & Smith, 2008). These views by Kachru and Smith are interesting, considering how the English as a lingua franca paradigm sees language today, as can be seen from the upcoming sections, which will discuss the differences and similarities of WEs and English as a lingua franca and provide reasons why the latter may be the more suitable theory for the current world climate.

2.2 English as a lingua franca

English as a lingua franca (ELF) generally means that English is being used in context internationally where some if not all speakers do not use English as their first language, meaning that native speakers are often the minority in the interaction (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). This view

of using English is very different from the traditional English as a foreign language (EFL) or English as a second language (ESL) views in that the goal is not to interact purely with native speakers, but with speakers from many different backgrounds in learning English (Kiczkowski & Lowe, 2019). The earliest versions of ELF and ELF research only included non-native speakers in the phenomenon of ELF (Firth, 1996). But as can be seen from more modern definitions of the term, it now includes all speakers of the language to the term, if there are non-native speakers present in the interaction. As David Crystal cleverly states in his book: *‘why a language becomes a global language has little to do with the number of people who speak it. It is much more to do with who those speakers are’* (2003, p 7). This quote describes in a great way what it means to be a global language. It is being used by many different people from many different places, and there is no set amount of people that makes a language automatically a global language. This means that the amount of mother tongue speakers does not make a language a lingua franca (Spanish has the most mother tongue speakers in the world with some 20 countries) and the easiness of the grammar of the language does not make it a lingua franca either (Crystal, 2003). What made English a lingua franca, was from the power of the users, usually political and military power (Crystal, 2003). The growth and explosion of economics due to industrialization around the world also provided English the chance to climb to the top (Crystal, 2003). As one of the biggest examples of this growth and impact on English around the world is The United States and its economical role in the modern world after the Second World War (Schneider, 2006).

Who benefits from English being a global language then? You can look at many places where having a global language is very useful. For example, different international communities, such as UNSECO, The World Bank, international academics, and business benefit greatly from having one global language that everyone knows (Crystal, 2003). These fields and communities are also heavily enabled by the rise of communication technologies and travel by air, which means that these factors have also helped English become a global language (Crystal, 2003). Despite the many benefits of a global language, some people have raised concerns about the possible dangers of it as well. Concerns like English creating an elite class of monolingual speakers that are dismissive towards other languages, laziness to learn any other languages, disappearance of minority languages and even making other languages unnecessary have been raised (Crystal, 2003). However, the rise of a global language like English has not been seen to cause many issues such as these, for example when it comes to minority languages. English would not influence the minority languages existing in Germany, or Finland for example, since

the majority language is not English (Crystal, 2003). To the contrary, many movements have been able to be raised to protect these minority languages due to the access of English on the global scale (Crystal, 2003). English has also become the majority language in many parts of the media. Press, advertising, broadcasting, cinema, and popular music have become more and more English dominant (Crystal, 2003).

Today, most movies you go to see in Finland are from Hollywood, and therefore in English, most popular and played songs worldwide are in English, and with the access to the internet, everyone can listen to them. Social media presence in the modern day has a lot of English content and influencers communicate in English even if they are not native to the US or any other Inner circle country. These factors show that English has become a global language that can be seen and used everywhere in the world, and the necessity of research on this field is therefore very much justified. These developments have led to the formation of new Englishes, as have also been mentioned in the previous section about World Englishes (Crystal, 2003; Bolton, 2006a). The development of dialects in many inner and outer circle countries show that there is an identity in the speakers of English that do not worry about the standard variety and think that it is necessary (Crystal, 2003). Therefore, identity is necessary for the international varieties of English as well, as that identity will reduce conflict between intelligibility and identity (Crystal, 2003). Identity is important in language use, as Pennycook (2007) says that language use is not just repetition of previous grammatical structure but a “semiotic restructuring” as a claim to one’s identity as a speaker.

In Europe, ELF has taken over in many places, like advertising, education, and public domains such as media, and two distinct ways of using English in Europe has developed: first, the force of conservation where traditional norms are protected and reinforced, and second, the force of innovation that changes the existing norms (Seidlhofer & Breiteneder, 2006). This struggle between the two norms is visible even today in the way the EU discourse is done, with Brexit and other different issues rising questions about the use of English in European communication. Despite these struggles, English is still used as a lingua franca with communicative needs in minds in many different contexts, such as conference calls, international publishing etc. and in these instances, English is used as a cross-linguistic or an international mean of communication (Seidlhofer & Breiteneder, 2006). In this communication, prestige and effective communication are strongly connected with linguistic correctness. This means that effective communication where everyone is understood and can understand is seen as more important than grammatic consistency or correctness. As mentioned previously, problems are seen with English becoming

a lingua franca in Europe. The problem Europe, especially the EU faces, is how to conserve multilingualism while still having a common language of communication so a community that surpasses borders and other boundaries in the EU can be formed (Seidlhofer & Breiteneder, 2006). This problem is still present in today's EU, with The UK leaving the European Union and the discussion about the position of English that followed. Seidlhofer & Breiteneder (2006) proposed as a solution to have ELF as its own concept whose lingua cultural norms are not defined by the native speakers of English. With the UK leaving, only Ireland is left as native speakers in the EU, so native speakers defining the English use of other members should not be an issue today, but the position of English in general has as mentioned previously. This review, while old, has stayed rather relevant through the years with the political changes and problems that have faced the EU.

The earlier section on World Englishes promotes the idea of looking at English in that way. But differing opinions exist in the field of linguistics. According to Davies (2005), while the three circles divide the speakers into native, second and foreign language speakers, one should use this model flexibly. This means that even if someone lives in a country with native speakers, they may not be a native speaker of the language, or a person living in a foreign language country may feel that their linguistic competence is more of a second language speaker's. As an example of situations like these, I personally view my competence and use of English as being more of a second language speaker than a foreign language speaker despite living in Finland and having studied English as a foreign language in school. Simplifying language use is dangerous due to the many different contexts where language can be used in. Thinking about these different contexts and ways of language use is the starting point for studying the context in said language use (Davies, 2005). Even in the Inner circle, there are differences on how language is being used. Varieties in dialects and accents such as Midland English or Southern accents/dialects are very common and are spoken by native English speaker while sounding very different from the norm (Schneider, 2006). Bolton (2006b) defends the Kachruvian approach and calls it a "historical model" that aims to conceptualize the chronology of the diasporic origins of WEs, meaning the first diaspora to Australia, New Zealand, and the USA, and the second one to the colonies in Africa and Asia. As Davies (2005) said, ownership of English has become pluralistic and the inner circle and those using English as a first language are being challenged more and more, both in everyday use, and in the field of research. English has also developed into a language that has been appropriated into use by people in different

context to fit their own needs and contexts, as Davies (2005) also predicted. Bolton (2006) further defends the paradigm with this quote from Kachru:

“The Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle cannot be viewed as clearly demarcated from each other; they have several shared characteristics, and the status of English in the language policies of such countries changes from time to time. What is an ESL region may at one time become an EFL region at another time or vice versa” – Kachru, 1985, pp. 13-14.

On a quick look this quote may seem to be fitting to the current ELF paradigm that will be discussed later, but there is one major difference that can be seen and where the quote fails to defend the WE paradigm. As mentioned by Davies (2005) and supported by Fang (2017), the Kachruvian paradigm of WEs treats languages inside these Circles while not considering the flexibility inside these circles. As the quote reads, Kachru says that an ESL language can become an EFL language and vice versa, moving these languages between each other. This is one of the drawbacks of this paradigm, as it characterises languages in a norm-dependant way, where the diversity of Englishes is not realized fully (Fang, 2017). As I expressed my view on my language use as an example earlier, thinking my English use fits more that of an Outer Circle speaker, but according to the WE paradigm I am to be still considered a foreign language speaker. For this reason, the paradigm used in this thesis and research is not the WE paradigm but rather the more commonly used English as a lingua franca (EFL) paradigm.

The traditional view of linguistics also is relevant in the development of ELF studies, in where the forms and structure are investigated a lot more (Davies, 2005). In terms of contribution to ELF research, Jennifer Jenkins has been a very influential researcher on the field (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). Her study “The Phonology of English as a Lingua Franca” (2000) she cast away the need for English users to speak like natives to be intelligible (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). In her study, she found that many of the pronunciations teachers thought were challenging for students were in fact not relevant to being an intelligible speaker (such as vowel quality, stress timing, vowel reduction or word stress) in global contexts (Jenkins, 2000). Instead, linguistic features like consonant sounds (excluding <th>), nuclear stress and vowel length were extremely important when it comes to having an intelligible interaction in global contexts (Jenkins, 2000). These features she found would later be called “The Lingua Franca Core” (LFC). The LFC aimed to find linguistic features that are stable across many nationalities and linguistic backgrounds that would contribute to intelligible production of language, and if achieved, they could be taught, and it would improve speakers’ abilities to communicate in global contexts

(Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). This view has since been questioned by many by saying that global English or ELF does not exist as a single variety and that it is way too fluid to be pinned as a set variety of English and has therefore been abandoned by researchers (Kachru & Smith, 2008; Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019).

The modern view of linguistics is also the dominant view of ELF research today, in which more emphasis is put on how and why people use a language in a certain way and on the dynamic interrelationship between said language and communicative function (Davies, 2005). These communicative strategies that ELF users employ in their speech are what researchers focus today (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). ELF research has also developed from the times of Jenkins' (2000) *Lingua Franca Core* to a more context focused direction. In contrast to the *Lingua franca Core*, Kohn (2018) writes that ELF communication is not just another variety of English. The effectiveness of ELF communication is instead reliant on the communicative competences of the speakers. In ELF communication, a failure is when the communication is disrupted by temporary or fundamental weaknesses of the ELF speakers' communication skills, differences in their lingua cultural backgrounds or a mismatch of their linguistic-communicative skills and the task of communication currently present (Kohn, 2018).

When ELF speakers communicate, one should not be surprised if the speakers want to reach a certain level of fluency in their speech in terms of thematic refinement, grammatical accuracy, or situational awareness (Kohn, 2018). As a result, their failure to reach these levels of fluency may make them feel dissatisfied with their performance leading to feeling dissatisfied with their performance should not be surprising either (Albl-Mikasa, 2013). Feelings of inadequacy and low self-esteem are therefore relevant issues in ELF communication, even if the phenomenon itself does not differentiate the different ways of speaking English. More about the topic of self-esteem and self-confidence will be discussed in the next section. As mentioned before, ELF has sometimes been an "incorrect" way to speak English (Seildhofer, 2011). This presents an interesting point when it comes to native speakers, however. When non-native speaker uses English in a non-standard form, code-switches to their own language or uses non-standard vocabulary in their speech, it is seen as a mistake or incorrect use of language (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). When a native speaker makes the same mistake however, it is only seen as a slip up or even as part of the regional dialect the person is using (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). This would be called multilingual competence and a positive thing, which presents a double standard (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). ELF speakers are often critiqued by their use of language by others, while we all have seen many native speakers on television, movies, or any other form of media

use English in a non-standard way (one example being the use of double negative ‘‘We do not have no time for that’’). This kind of language use is not treated the same way as ELF speakers often are. English should be an intricate, beautiful expression of certain cultures, their people, and societies, regardless of them being native speakers or not (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). Interactions in ELF operate very differently from native speaker-native speaker communication. This is evident in blurring of intelligibility and comprehensibility in interlanguage interactions (Pickering, 2006). ELF speakers use accommodation and strategies of communication that are unique to their own context and this may conflict with the ways native speakers communicate and negotiate meaning in communication (Pickering, 2006).

2.3 English as a lingua franca in education

ELF has been researched in many ways through these past years. One major area of study has been in the field of education. The principles of ELF very clearly go against the very traditional way of how English has been taught in the past and that has sparked a lot of debate on how English should be taught moving forward (Sifakis & Tsantila, 2018). The views of ELF and English as a foreign language (EFL) have been at odd with each other for a long time and ELF researchers have different opinions on how the subject should be handled. Some want the abolishment of the current system of EFL while others are for the integration of ELF into the current EFL teaching (Seidlhofer & Widdowson, 2018; Kohn, 2018). What is also seen important in ELF is how teachers and other people in power must be ELF aware (Kohn, 2018; Kordia, 2018). This awareness is seen as necessary to being able to implement ELF in teaching in a meaningful way. On top of this, the implementation of ELF aware teaching is also important. This means that teaching English from an ELF perspective should be done using methods that advocate learning that suits it. Having suitable learning materials for example is an important aspect in any form of teaching, and ELF is no exception, be it existing material or new ones made by the teacher (Lopriore & Vettorel, 2018; Tantiranat & Fay, 2018). In the upcoming sections I will discuss ELF in education from these different points of view, first ELF in comparison to EFL, second ELF awareness and what that has to do with confidence of students and third what kind of teaching is suitable for ELF teaching.

2.3.1 ELF versus EFL

All different perspectives of ELF recognize that current traditional EFL teaching has severe limitations and carries a big burden (Sifakis & Tsantila, 2018). This means that EFL teaching does not prepare language speakers to speak English in a way that is relevant to their own contexts. In traditional structural approach of English, the learner would have learned a certain syllabus and certain grammatical structures of English (Seidlhofer & Widdowson, 2018). This approach tries to isolate the language to make it easier to learn. Language is not ever an abstract and will always actualized to serve a purpose in communication, however (Seidlhofer & Widdowson, 2018). An approach that serves a purpose in communication, as introduced by Seidlhofer and Widdowson (2018) is called Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). This approach focuses on the pragmatics of English language and how it functions. Unfortunately, this approach has been traditionally used to conform students to the norms of standard ways of speaking English (Seidlhofer & Widdowson, 2018). According to Kohn (2018), This basically means that students will learn English without differentiating between English as knowledge and English as a communicative use. He also says that this means learning by copying what is taught and learners cannot use their own models of learning to facilitate language learning. This pedagogical orientation is seen as the “strict” way of EFL teaching (Kohn, 2018).

These ideals create the current EFL teaching methods that ELF contradicts. EFL is built on communicative teaching, which then is used to teach norms that fit the users of standard English, even if even the native speakers of English do not speak or use the language in those ways (Kiczowskiak & Lowe, 2019). In terms of pronunciation, this means sounding as native as possible. This is done so the speaker would sound as intelligible as possible. However, a study by Smith and Rafiqzad (1979) with over 1300 people from 11 countries found that the general American English accent was the second least intelligible from the chosen nine varieties. This is despite all the other speakers’ nationalities being from non-native speaker countries. An old study like this shows, that even when there was less awareness of different Englishes around the world, they were still more intelligible than a standard variety of English that is taught in many countries. On top of this, a research was conducted by Smith and Nelson (2006) where they found similar results, finding that in terms of intelligibility, comprehensibility and interpretability, native speakers were not the most easily understood. They were also not able to understand other varieties of English the best, showing that being native is not as important as being fluent in English and being familiar with different national varieties of English (Smith &

Nelson, 2006). This shows that the growing number of Englishes is not the problem in understanding culture granted the user is familiar with different varieties (Smith & Nelson, 2006).

This does not mean that one should not learn about standard varieties of English, however. Knowing about the standard varieties is valuable since speakers may someday interact with people coming from areas speaking it but since there are much more non-native speakers than native speakers, learning about many different accents is also important since many of those they will hear outside of the classroom (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). This is especially true in modern days where many people communicate with people around the world, through their jobs or online video games for example. Learning about different accents will enable language users to communicate and understand each other without the stress of sounding too different from the standard varieties of English. In other words, ELF orientation of English teaching promotes that teachers and learners should see English as a tool for communicating globally and be used to facilitate interaction with people from many nationalities and linguistic backgrounds (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). Seidlhofer and Widdowson (2018) also say that while teachers may think that EFL they teach is the same as English as a native language (ENL), that is not the case. While the learners will learn English, it is not ENL that is being taught. This means that English taught as a foreign language is not the same as English learned as a foreign language ends up being (Seidlhofer & Widdowson, 2018). English learned as a foreign language, while it may try to conform to the native speaker norms of English, will always fail in some ways (Seidlhofer & Widdowson, 2018). This means that even if teachers try to teach standard varieties of English, as all of us who learn EFL can say, we never achieve the exact same way of speaking the language. Does this not mean we should focus on why these ‘errors’ in learning happen? As Seidlhofer and Widdowson (2018), language learners do not learn the exact language they are being taught, but they do learn from the language they are being taught. Learning from experiences with the language is something we all experience with our first spoken language (L1), so why would not the same work for our second language (L2) as well? (Seidlhofer & Widdowson, 2018) The non-conformities or ‘errors’ that occur are then seen as the result of pragmatic transfer (Seidlhofer & Widdowson, 2018). The resulting non-conformities are not the same as native speaker norms, but they are still communicatively salient and most often have minimal effect on the actual communication (Seidlhofer, Widdowson, 2018). In short, even if teachers try to teach EFL in a way that aims for the native speaker norms, learners will always end up learning ELF, since English learned as a foreign language searches for meaning in communication (Seidlhofer & Widdowson, 2018).

When it comes to learning ELF, Kohn (2018) thinks that it and EFL “got off on the wrong foot” and has a good idea on how ELF can be achieved in current EFL climate without completely disrupting the existing methods of teaching English. He uses a social constructivist approach, where language is learned by “creating their own version of it in their minds, hearts and behaviour” (Kohn, 2011 p 80). This means that learners must develop their own interpretation of English in their minds and this is guided by things like the individual lingua cultural background and learning experiences, their own goals in learning and motivation, the effort they want to put in and the approach of learning-teaching they choose and finally, the language and communication they take part in and speech fellowships they are included in (Kohn, 2018). This perspective helps students and learners to develop their own competence that is suitable to their context and communicative purposes (Kohn, 2018). This means that every learner is free to set their own goals in language learning and while some want to be more fluent than the others, achieving the balance between their own knowledge and the use of linguistic expression that is required by the learners themselves (Kohn, 2018). This way language learning is seen as being successful. In other words, every learner sets their own learning goals in terms of communicative competence and fluency and once they themselves feel balanced and confident in their knowledge, they have achieved language learning. These constructions of creativity are very important in ELF, because while the same could be implemented in EFL, the affirmation of creativity is so closely related to the norms of standard varieties of English that ends up having the standard variety to be the end goal (Kohn, 2018). In ELF language learning the learner itself sets the goal of communicative competence. Even EFL can benefit from Kohn’s (2011; 2015) social constructivist approach, where EFL follows an implicit understanding of language as a social constructivist process of enabling emotional, cognitive, and behavioural creation.

While Seidlhofer and Widdowson (2018) can be seen criticizing EFL a lot more and calling for change, Kohn (2018) on the other hand is more careful about dismantling the pre-existing EFL teaching. Other researchers like Siqueira and Matos (2018) join this method by saying that they would implement ELF teaching to the current climate of EFL to provide new insight to existing teaching methods, materials etc. Similarly, Kemaloglu-Er and Bayuurt (2018) discuss that while ELF teaching focuses on intelligibility and comprehensibility of the speakers, antagonizing EFL teaching as something “wrong” should still be avoided. They say that ELF is not about destroying EFL teaching, but rather that a balance should be found between the two methods of teaching. In the end, ELF and EFL, while different from each other, do not need to be in

conflict. ELF can be implemented in many ways to the current ways of teaching. What is important, is that there is enough awareness and skill from teachers to execute ELF teaching in their own classroom.

2.3.2 ELF awareness and student confidence

It is not enough to implement ELF methods into teaching just for the sake of it. This is clear to any professional in the field of education. It is very important for the stakeholders in the field to be aware of ELF as a phenomenon and how to implement in a meaningful way to their work. As previously stated, ELF does not conform to the native speaker norms of English speaking and teaching. What teachers are expected to do in ELF is to raise students' awareness about ELF and how they can communicate in English without conforming to said norms that they may previously have thought they need to follow (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). Kohn (2018) explains that developing awareness to different forms of the English language is the beginning of becoming ELF competent. He continues that the requirements of evaluation must be flexible and open to interaction to learners' ELF exposure and experience. Comprehension of ELF should focus on the foreign pronunciation, sentence structures and other challenging issues in phonology in language learning (Kohn, 2018). This goes together with being aware of the Lingua Franca Core by Jenkins (2000), due to the guidelines it can provide in ELF awareness. Zoghbor (2011) supports LFC teaching methods, because they can lead to student groups learning more successfully in the classroom when it comes to communication. LFC should still not be treated as a variety of English that is taught, but it can be used to provide insight in challenged ELF speakers can face when learning. ELF speaking cannot only be learned inside the classroom. The students must push themselves into learning in normal communication settings, outside the restricted area of the classroom (Kohn, 2018). This push to communicate aims for the comprehension and production competences necessary to achieve communicative interaction, where speakers use language in creative ways and try to be understood and/or understand another speaker.

According to Kohn (2018) a challenging part about ELF is the non-native speaker creativity in linguistic-communicative resources of the ELF speaker. This creativity is necessary for the non-native speaker of English to establish conditions for developing their agency, sense of ownership, satisfaction, and self-confidence in ELF interaction (Kohn, 2015). Aiding in reaching these goals of ELF-awareness, Sifakis and Bayyurt (2015) describe a framework for ELF-

awareness that is aimed at teachers: teachers must have a critical and open-minded perspective towards their own teaching and aim at challenging and reorganizing their old and far back in time reaching viewpoints about EFL pedagogy and native speakerism. They also highlight that the autonomy of teachers in ELF-awareness, meaning that teachers are empowered to change things in their local teaching contexts instead of complying to authority, such as research or government. Native speakerism in this context means the favouritism of native speakers in language learning situations (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). More about ELF-awareness in teaching, specifically in the next section. Llurda and Mocanu (2018) present a five-stage model for non-native speakers of English to facilitate the raising of ELF awareness: 1. Exposure to realistic situations, including examples of both cultural and linguistic diversity 2. Data analysis that shows the performance of non-native speaker professionals 3. Academic uses of ELF and the analysis of it 4. Future perspectives and ideas for international/global English 5. Reflecting on one's teaching identity, context, condition and the idealized but achievable second language identity. From these stages, the first, fourth and fifth stages seem especially important in terms of self-improvement and building of teachers' self-confidence, while the second and third are more professional ways of increasing awareness in ELF.

Self-confidence is very important when it comes to learning languages, as have been mentioned in previous sections. This is true for both teachers and students. It is very important for teachers to have confidence in their language use, so they can guide their students to become confident language users as well. In Sougari's (2018) study, she explores teachers' sense of efficacy, which is very closely related to self-confidence, being borderline a synonym for it. She explains that this efficacy is based on the teacher being ELF-aware in their work. This means that teachers make decisions about their teaching context, engage with ELF principles, and take a proactive stance by changing their own views about issues that are taken as a given, for example standardness of language, fluency and accuracy or non-native speaker's ownership of English and reflect on the effects of instructional paths (Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2015). Relating to teacher's self-efficacy, Sougari's (2018) study investigated Greek teachers about their sense of efficacy in ELF teaching. The study concluded that teachers were overall positive about the promotion of ELF in their teaching but thought that it was easier to adopt it in a way, where they would make their learners eventually more aware of issues relating to ELF. Sougari (2018) concluded that awareness of the ELF framework and self-efficacy are necessary to adopt ELF-activities in teaching. She found that most difficulties for self-efficacy are external issues, such as parents'

expectations, learners' indifference to learning and stakeholders and their own guidelines. Using ELF-aware pedagogy is an answer to the "inner drive" or select teachers who wish to make changes to their teaching and those who go through training in ELF (Sougari, 2018). In terms of promoting ELF, shortcomings in English proficiency are not a barrier to promotion of ELF, which makes teachers more confident in their skills while not being afraid of sounding like a non-native speaker (Sougari, 2018). In fact, native speakers do not necessarily make great English teachers, rather what is necessary for a good English teacher, is the pedagogical training that properly prepares them for their job (Kiczowski & Lowe, 2019). As Kumaravadivelu (2016) states, teacher should be valued by their professional skills in English, not by the accident of birth.

After the teacher is sufficiently confident in their ELF teaching skills, what comes next is helping students achieve the same. This is supported by Baumgardner (2006) saying that non-native speakers are not worse teachers than native speaker and may be better teacher in Outer Circle or Expanding Circle countries. In lower levels of English learning, students are often not confident in their English skills and struggle more, especially in listening, which means there are more prone to developing negative emotions towards language learning in general (Unver, 2017). It is also important for teachers to foster a positive environment in the classroom and guide students to perceive their communicative competences well since this has been shown to correlate with willingness to communicate in English and on the other side, lack of these will increase anxiety that the students may feel (Ghonsooly et al, 2014). A study by Fushino (2010) also showed that confidence in communication influences willingness to communicate in group work situations and that developing both confidence in communication and beliefs in group working situations would trigger more student-to-student interactions in EFL classrooms. This shows that teachers can have positive effects on students' confidence in language learning, and ELF-awareness and ELF teaching are the key to success in terms of improving students' confidence in their language skills. Increasing students' confidence does not just have an impact on their activity in the classroom and communication in general, it can also improve other areas of their studies. Park and Lee (2006) showed that if students' confidence in oral performance was high, they would do better in tests, while lower confidence students did more poorly. These higher confidence students also had a more positive view of speaking English, while lower confidence students showed lower range in oral performance in grammar and vocabulary for example (Par & Lee, 2006). This shows that improving students' confidence improves their skills in many areas of their own studies. Therefore, ELF- aware teaching does not only improve

communicative competences of students, but it can also improve their academic competences as well by reducing nervousness and anxiety. High levels of confidence in both teachers and students empower language learning, and ELF-awareness is the starting point for creating a high-confidence classroom. Once ELF-awareness is reached, teachers can focus on how they can teach ELF in different ways that make learning ELF meaningful for all students.

2.3.3 ELF in teaching

Teaching ELF is not something that can be done just for the sake of having it. ELF-teaching is a decision that the teacher makes in their mind and it is not influenced by authorities outside of the teaching context (Sifakis, 2014). This means that teachers should have the agency to review the contents of their teaching materials and other tools they are provided with and change them into something they can use in their own classroom setting, in this case, in a way that promotes ELF in a meaningful way. Once teachers have acquired the ELF-awareness discussed above, they can begin teaching ELF-awareness to their students as well. Davies (2005) says that it is important for teachers to be aware of the issues of power in English interactions. Teachers need to be aware that there can be situations both in and outside of the classroom, where one speaker is more fluent than the other, which can make the other speaker feel that they are inadequate, the other person is more knowledgeable etc. (Davies 2005). According to Davies (2005), this can lead to the other speaker less willing to communicate in English. In general ELF teaching is about showing students that native speaker norms are not always the goal, providing many different models of language, preparing them for the diversity of English languages they may encounter in their future life, teaching intercultural skills and abandoning the ideas of having to stick to the traditional models of British or American English to be a fluent language user (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). As have been discussed above, sticking to the traditional norms of British or American English could in fact make the speaker a less successful ELF user due to the higher likelihood of misunderstanding something, instead of missing letters from words, using a wrong term or using their first language to accommodate their communication (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). Using terms that are technically wrong like “unpossible” (impossible) can lead to the exact same understanding than using the correct term, meaning that communication has been successful (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). In this situation, the “wrong” term also uses an existing linguistic pattern *un-*, which is a negative form of a noun. It could therefore be seen that the speaker repurposes the language to fit their own needs and the communicative situation they are currently in (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). This does not mean that teacher

should be teaching to pronounce and write these terms in this way, but teachers should be aware of these accommodation strategies and realize that in the end they do not influence the understanding of the language (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019).

Teachers' awareness of ELF also naturally leads them to developing ELF-aware teaching materials and methods. What kind of methods, material and assessment can teachers do to promote ELF and the awareness of it in their own classroom contexts? Staring out, Dewey and Patsko (2018) have suggested something called plurilingual focus, where both teachers and students use their first language (L1) in English classes to facilitate learning. This means that the L1 language is used as a resource during classes in ways like code-switching (switching between the first language and the foreign language) (Dewey & Patsko, 2018). In many countries, English is the only spoken language in the classroom, so according to this research, this view should be changed. Dewey and Patsko (2018) suggest using dictionaries, L1 to correct language etc. to facilitate more meaningful learning experiences.

In Kordia's (2018) research, she implemented three different activities specifically built to raise awareness to ELF, which proved successful despite the struggles that came with implementing them for the first time. She implemented these in her own foreign language learning classroom, and the activities included group work activities relating to the phenomenon of ELF. Kemaloglu-Er and Bayyurt (2018) also discuss different activities that are ELF-aware and could be implemented to the existing classroom culture of the teacher. They say that to be able to be ELF-aware, teachers should be actively engaged with theory about ELF. Then, when developing ELF-aware lessons, there are two ways of implementing it: explicit and implicit (Kemaloglu-Er & Bayyurt 2018). Kemaloglu-Er and Bayyurt (2018) recommend that these methods should be implemented in complementary ways to raise the ELF-awareness of students, as has been mentioned previously. In their study examples of both explicit and implicit methods are presented. Explicit methods include using videos of non-native speakers speaking about their experiences of being a non-native speaker, reflective conversations with students about the ways non-native speakers speak English and the content of speech (Kemaloglu-Er & Bayyurt 2018). Implicit methods include incorporating the culture of students to the lesson, having a non-native speaker introduce the topic of the current lesson that is totally irrelevant to the topic of ELF through video and role play where students portray people from non-native speaker countries and discuss the specific problems that they may face (Kemaloglu-Er & Bayyurt 2018). According to Kemaloglu-Er and Bayyurt (2018), both methods help promote ELF-awareness. In this situation the teacher will be ELF-aware, being able to use both explicit and implicit methods of

ELF-aware teaching while not aiming to convince the student to adopt ELF as the one and only way of learning English (Kemaloglu-Er & Bayyurt 2018). There is not either/or situations when teaching ELF-awareness. The differences between explicit and implicit ways of ELF-aware teaching are also important to distinguish. Explicit models of ELF-aware teaching promote open discussions about ELF while implicit methods are more indirect and while explicit methods aim to make students conscious about ELF, implicit methods aim to have a more subconscious effect (Kemaloglu-Er & Bayyurt 2018). Explicit methods are suitable for shorter training sessions, while implicit methods can be implemented through an entire semester for example (Kemaloglu-Er & Bayyurt 2018). More importantly, especially in contexts and countries where there is a lot of scrutiny in English teaching, implicit methods can be used together with standard English methods to try and promote ELF even in a more traditional setting (Kemaloglu-Er & Bayyurt 2018). When teachers begin teaching in ELF-aware ways, implicit methods can complement teaching after starting the lesson with an explicit activity (Kemaloglu-Er & Bayyurt 2018). These are some of the ways how ELF can be implemented in one's teaching in different contexts.

Another way of developing ELF-aware English teaching was found by Tantiranat and Fay (2018). They found two ways, first one being investigating the curricular documents of your teaching context and finding new forms for them where there is ambiguity and using checklists that have been modified. With these teachers can determine what part of their EFL teaching already works with ELF-aware English teaching and in turn ponder what is missing from their current EFL context to become more ELF-aware (Tantiranat & Fay, 2018). These checklists and investigative actions can help teachers find resources that are ELF-aware in their existing materials and textbooks and plan what they should do to fill the holes in the existing material (Tantiranat & Fay 2018). When it comes to lesson planning, there are things to be done to be more ELF-aware as well.

Lopriore and Vettorel (2018) conducted a study where they asked university students to plan and develop ELF-aware teaching materials and propose solutions to make existing materials more ELF-aware. According to them, lesson planning is one of the more engaging tasks that teachers can do, because it gives them opportunities to shape their teaching to be meaningful for their subjective context in activities, materials, and evaluation. What becomes important in ELF-aware language learning and development of materials, is the authenticity of the language use, which goes deeper than just making materials that have authentic tasks (Lopriore & Vettorel 2018). What is also included according to Lopriore and Vettorel (2018), is asking the

learners of the language to complete a real task through language use. They say that it is therefore important that teachers and educators investigate the input that the current course-books provide and identify the authentic resources and adapt them to integrate them into the lesson plan.

Another angle is provided by Siqueira and Matos (2018), where they analysed textbooks in Brazil and tried bringing ELF to the forefront and bring more awareness to teachers. They found that textbooks tend to follow native speaker norms and the stereotypical cultural aspects of said native speaker cultures. This is also true for most other countries in the expanding circle (Siqueira & Matos 2018). Through their investigation, Siqueira and Matos (2018) found that teachers can include experimental ELF-based activities in traditional textbooks that exist in expanding circle countries to promote ELF-aware learning. They say that instead of focusing solely on the native speaker contexts of language speaking and cultures, local contexts should be taken into consideration as well. Appreciation of these local contexts in English lessons can provide more relevant and meaningful cultural and linguistic experiences for learners (Siqueira & Matos 2018). These methods can follow the methods presented by Kemaloglu-Er and Bayyurt (2018) earlier. Thinking about examples of activities relating to the local contexts, students could listen to clips online where the people speaking are from their local context. This way they can hear the English that is spoken in their context in actual use, where they can relate to the language users and become more aware ELF language users in the process. These examples show that using existing materials and course-books/textbooks can be correct, if the teacher as an ELF-aware language user can identify the meaningful and useful materials in the materials and include them into their teaching. What is lacking from the materials can then be supplemented by teacher's own planned and developed activities or resources that fill the holes left by existing teaching materials.

Final important part of ELF-teaching and teaching in general is assessment. English testing has traditionally been focused on learning standard varieties of English and have included idioms and sayings that have barely anything to do with the context the test taker is from (Elder & Davies 2006). Elder and Davies (2006) present arguments for ELF norms: including more valid representations of target language use domains, positive impact on test takers which decreases anxiety and positive washback effects due to the design of the syllabus being designed for the use of ELF users instead of mostly unattainable native speaker norms. They also criticize completely transitioning to ELF testing and assessment, saying that codified and stable ELF would

just become another variety where other excel and others do not, like the traditional EFL methods. Elder and Davies (2006) do acknowledge that ELF has potential in contributing to the change in testing by reducing emphasis on linguistic code and help refine the understanding of the pragmatics of intercultural and cross-cultural encounters. A more recent look into assessment in ELF shows the more modern outlook where ELF is not seen as a potential new variety of English like in Elder and Davies' (2006) article.

Kouvdoou and Tsagari (2018) agree that testing is still mostly reflective of inner-circle norms of English and focus on native-like accuracy in grammar and oral competence. This means that assessment that has more ELF awareness is required for teachers to be able to assess their students in their EFL contexts. A method for this is alternative assessment, where procedures that are less formal are used, they are taken from a longer period and are lower stakes than traditional tests and exams and have more positive washback effects (Alderson & Banerjee 2001). A link between alternative assessment and ELF has also been found (Kouvdoou & Tsagari 2018). When assessing oral proficiency in ELF, it means that the most important part is to be able to communicate effectively in English at an international level, have an accent that is intelligible and be able to accommodate effectively in conversations (Kouvdoou & Tsagari 2018). According to Kouvdoou and Tsagari (2018), this means that native-like features are unnecessary in ELF oral communication, but it is important to understand different accents, be able to accommodate to reach a common understanding and negotiate meaning appropriately. This shows that ELF oral communication is not throwing away all rules in communication, but it rather focuses on how speakers can communicate with each other effectively even with differences in language skills. The assessment of these things is still very important and alternative assessment is suitable for this kind of communication. Another form of assessment in ELF is presented by Fang (2017). They propose something called ToPIC (Teaching of Pronunciation for Intercultural Communication), where teachers and students are aware of the complicated culture and context of teaching to promote language awareness on the global status of English and design new attitudes towards it to put the new ideas and theories into practice (Fang, 2016). Tasks for this method could include many different performative tasks that focus on linguistic skills (Fang, 2017). In this method, native standards are not the main concern but rather the goal of this method is speaking English to not be some hierarchy that cannot be seen like in many international tests (Fang, 2017). English should rather be a global skill that will enable people to develop into global citizens and provide ways for them seek for opportunities in an international arena (Fang, 2017).

There are many ways to implement ELF in all aspects of teaching. These methods and perspectives are designed to be flexible to a global context, as ELF itself is supposed to be. The relevant context in Finland is of course the Finnish context and the next section will discuss how English and English teaching has developed in Finland and how ELF fits into the Finnish way of English teaching.

2.4 English teaching and use in Finland

English language has been taught in Finland for a long time now. Ever since the comprehensive school reform in late 1970s it has been a stable foreign language in the Finnish school system. As many other Outer circle countries, Finland started including English through education and training, unlike the Outer Circle countries where this was mainly achieved through colonization (Leppänen & Nikula, 2008). In 1960-1980 English was used purely to converse with other people coming from other countries (Leppänen & Nikula, 2008). Due to modernization the development of technology etc. English has taken a completely different role in Finland (Leppänen & Nikula, 2008). It has become an everyday language in work and home life on most Finnish citizens (Leppänen & Nikula, 2008).

As has been mentioned previously, Leppänen and Nikula (2008) also criticize the WEs model of Kachru, saying how it sets speakers into specific circles and does not consider the different contexts on and how language is learned inside said contexts. They therefore prefer a model that considers these contexts and language situations which focus on the position of English instead of the rigid circles. The theory in this section will reflect this criticism, taking examples from different Finnish contexts and presenting them instead of talking about English in Finland as one big entity. The only exception to this will be discussion about the new core curriculum for the comprehensive school. All teaching in Finland is based on the guidelines provided in this curriculum and that is why it is necessary to discuss anything that related to Finnish education. The new core curriculum was devised in 2014 and was put in use in 2016 (Opetushallitus, 2014). This section will begin by discussing this new curriculum and how it takes ELF into account in it and after I will discuss different teaching contexts in Finland where ELF is relevant.

2.4.1 The core curriculum

Before even investigating the goals of English language teaching in the new curriculum, the principles of ELF can be seen in the overall multidisciplinary goals of the curriculum as well (Opetushallitus, 2014). Goal two (L2) of the multidisciplinary goals called “cultural knowledge, interaction and expression” include the learning of respect and learning to communicate with different people in different situations (Opetushallitus, 2014). Communicating is encouraged even with very limited amount of language skills which follow closely to the principles of ELF (Opetushallitus, 2014).

Moving on to the goals of the English language teaching in the grades 3-6. In Finland most pupils start learning English on the third grade, but lately English has been integrated into teaching even as early as the first grade. Goals for the subject itself, however, start from the third grade onward (Opetushallitus, 2014). When comparing the goals of the elementary school level English to the ELF paradigm introduced in earlier sections of this thesis, it is very clear that most of the goals in English learning in the new curriculum for elementary level English include perspectives from the ELF paradigm. The first section of goals for English is called “growth to cultural diversity and language awareness”, which in itself shows signs of the ELF paradigm (Opetushallitus, 2014). The first three goals of the section, T1-T3, further emphasize this: T1 includes “guiding the pupil to take notice of the close environment’s and worlds linguistic and cultural abundance and the status of English as the language of global communication”, T2 includes “motivating the pupil to value his/her linguistic and cultural background and the linguistic and cultural diversity of the world and encounter people without prejudice”, and T3 consists of “guiding the pupil to observe the connecting and differentiating phenomena of languages support the development of linguistic understanding of the pupils” (Opetushallitus, 2014 p 219). These goals in English teaching coincide with the ELF paradigm and the ideas of awareness of ELF and differences of Englishes is the beginning of being ELF competent (Kohn, 2018).

The second relevant section in the contents of English teaching is called “developing language skills, skill to act during interaction” (Opetushallitus, 2014). The specific goals from this section and its subsections of knowing how to interpret texts and knowing how to produce texts, goals T7-T11 all fit the ELF paradigm. These goals all have to do with communication and learning how to act in communication. Goals T7-T9 describe “the guidance of the pupil to practice interactions in diverse situations and to encourage the continuation of said interaction

despite possible difficulties'', 'encouraging the pupil to uphold the communicative situation by using many ways to further the communication'', and ''support the cultural appropriateness of the pupil's communication by providing many different social situations to practice with'' (Opetushallitus, 2014 p 220). The goals T10 and T11 discuss providing the pupils with diverse texts to read and interpret while using diverse strategies of understanding and providing the pupils resources and possibilities to produce texts and speech while focusing on the most important ways of pronunciation and structures (Opetushallitus, 2014). These goals also promote the ELF paradigm by promoting the importance of communication and being understood (Kizckowiak and Lowe, 2019), while the latter goals promote the ideas of including ELF principles to traditional ways of learning pronunciation and reading (Kohn, 2018). As can be seen, most goals and contents of English learning in the latest core curriculum of Finnish elementary school are relevant to the ELF paradigm and its principles. This provides teachers possibilities to teach English in a way that promotes the globalization of English, something that many other countries may not have the luxury of.

When moving on to lower secondary school and grades 7-9, the principles of ELF carry over as well. The first section of contents with the same name as the elementary level continues to include goals related to ELF teaching, such as T1 discussing pupils skills in thinking about the position of English and the phenomena regarding its varieties, T2 encouraging to search of interesting English content and environments that further the pupil's understanding of the globalising world and the possibilities in acting in it, and finally T3 guiding the pupil to take note on what rules English has and how these things are said in other languages and use this to support their learning (Opetushallitus, 2014). T4 discusses the topic ''language learning skills'' where the pupil is encouraged to set goals and learn diverse ways of language learning while acting independently and in groups and guide the pupil into positive communication where the most important thing is to get the message across (Opetushallitus, 2014). These goals once again show that ELF perspectives exist in the Finnish curriculum even on the higher grade levels. The same section and subsections discussing the developing language skills as in elementary school naturally also include ELF paradigms: T6-T8 discussing different ways of communication and encouraging the pupil in different settings in communication, while T9 and T10 once again discuss providing the pupils with possibilities to hear and read different texts and interpret them using different strategies and guiding the pupil into producing different and meaningful texts both in speech and writing, respectively (Opetushallitus, 2014). These learning goals grow in

tandem with the grade levels and become more diverse in nature, which provides the pupils more possibilities in individual learning and growth as ELF-aware speakers.

As this section has shown, the new curriculum includes many goals that coincide with the principles of ELF, so the lack of guidance from the curriculum is not an obstacle in teaching global English and ELF perspectives in Finnish English language classes. Finally, the Finnish core curriculum also presents the ways of differentiation and support in English classes, where everyone is encouraged to speak on their own level and as much as possible because this is seen as the best way to develop one's language skills (Opetushallitus, 2014). These support systems combined with assessment that promotes self- and peer assessment that includes all the learning goals from the curriculum provides an excellent framework for developing ELF aware teaching in a classroom.

2.4.2 Finnish contexts of English use in school

After discussing the framework of all English teaching in Finland, it is time to discuss different ways of English teaching and aspects related to English teaching that are from different contexts and show the diversity of English learning and teaching in Finland. From the start of the new millennium, Finnish society has taken a lot of influence from the Anglo-American values and ways of living, which shows Finland's connection to the western world (Leppänen & Nikula, 2008). However, despite this increasing connection, the monolingual nature of Finnish people has not changed that much and has not made the lingua franca of English necessary for communication in everyday life, which has therefore not created a distinct variety of English that is spoken in Finland (Leppänen & Nikula, 2008). This is rapidly becoming different in the modern times. While Finnish is still the best way to be understood in many places, the necessity of English is becoming ever more important in my opinion due to immigration and globalization for example. ‘‘Finglish’’ is also becoming more and more recognized as a variety in which Finnish people often speak English. Before discussing the different contexts of teaching, I want to highlight three ways in which Finns speak English as presented by Leppänen and Nikula (2008). These are:

1. English as a mean of communication (entirely or mostly): in this way, English is the primary language used in communication due to it being the only common language. Used with

native speakers or someone using English as a foreign language (*lingua franca* communication)

2. Two languages in use (most often English and Finnish code-switching): used for example in online communication between Finns
3. Finnish as a mean of communication (entirely or mostly): Finnish communication with English terms mixed in, used for example in video game communication

These three ways of speaking English presented by Leppänen and Nikula (2008) are relevant when discussing the different contexts of English teaching and English use in Finland. These can serve as a guideline when investigating different contexts or as a framework for basing the different contexts. In this section I will discuss contexts mostly from the first two communicative situations due to them being the most relevant in the field of English teaching.

The first context of Finnish English teaching is a context of classrooms where Finnish is the language of instruction. According to the framework by Leppänen and Nikula (2008) this would fall into either the Mostly English-speaking or code-switching between English and Finnish depending on the classroom and the teacher. Nikula (2008) conducted a study in a classroom that employed the methods of “content and language integrated learning” (henceforth CLIL). In this study she aimed to find out how English is used in foreign language subject teaching, where English is the method of learning instead of being the target of learning. CLIL is a teaching method, where different subjects are taught in a foreign language with two goals in mind: to learn both the content and the language used in the teaching of a CLIL-class (Roiha, 2017). The possibilities that English provides in this communication was also investigated (Nikula, 2008). The participants were Finnish pupils and teachers in biology and physics class, ninth grade and seventh grade respectively (Nikula, 2008). What Nikula (2008) discovered in this discourse-pragmatic focused study, was that since these classes were voluntary, motivation to learn was higher (only nine students attended the biology class and six attended the physics class). The language used in these classes was mostly English even in situations not relating to teaching the subject, however Finnish was used as an aid when the English term was not familiar to the students (code-switching) (Nikula, 2008). This code-switching was found to be common in situations like this and also seemed to appear in situations where pupils wanted to show their capabilities in both languages. Nikula (2008) also found that communication with the teacher was common in class, which shows that active participation in class promotes learning. She concludes that English language subject teaching could be used with formal English lessons to promote learning and participation in class. This study also shows a connection to *lingua*

franca studies by having the participants not being native or qualified English teachers but completely non-native foreign language speakers (Nikula, 2008).

Another study with the same group of pupils and teachers was conducted by Kääntä (2008), the focus was to investigate the teacher's English use in English language subject teaching and what other methods of communication is used during the lessons. The target of investigation of this study was the turns of assessment of the teacher, where the teacher directs and controls the way in which communication is done in the classroom (Kääntä, 2008). In this discourse analysis Kääntä (2008) found that these turns of assessment of the teacher both limits the communication and pushes it forward. The language used in class is modified to fit the situation and non-verbal communication is used with verbal communication to advocate the turns of assessment in either stopping irrelevant chatter or enabling meaningful interaction in class (Kääntä, 2008). English is used as a tool for instructional activity and both pupils and teachers were found to use English without issue (Kääntä, 2008). Kääntä's (2008) conclusions are that language use is central in foreign language subject teacher's toolkit for teaching and the study shows that diverse linguistic forms and other means of building instructions are meaningful in different contexts. Since the goal during the lesson is not to learn English but a certain subject, teachers use different semiotic resources depending on the context to make themselves understood (Kääntä, 2008). This kind of communication is found in any institutionalized and everyday communication where people discuss either directly or indirectly (Kääntä, 2008).

These examples of learning in a CLIL environment show a context where English is used most of the time as the language of instruction and code-switching with Finnish is only used when there is confusion on the English terminology. These findings are supported by Nikula's (2015) later work, where she investigated the subject-specific language in CLIL education. She found that teachers who are not qualified English teachers but fluent English users in general are able to use different strategies during lessons in pre- and post-task phases. In these phases teachers subtly steer the pupils towards subject-specific English language terminology without a deliberate orientation to language (Nikula, 2015). This steering happened very implicitly without discussing the subject-specific properties of the language, showing that CLIL-teaching is more content than language oriented (Nikula, 2015). This study then shows that teaching in CLIL-classes and the language learning during these lessons is not the focus, it's just a side-effect when learning the subject. Nikula (2015) concludes that there is need for raising awareness in CLIL-teacher so that their subject teaching can also become more aware of the language used in the classes and not solely focus on the content. CLIL-teaching has however seen to be a

positive force in attitudes in life, language and cultures as showed by a study by Roiha (2017) where he investigated previous pupils of a CLIL-classroom. Research on CLIL-teaching has been shown to have positive impacts on language skills of the pupils who attend these classes (Roiha, 2017). The participants in Roiha's study felt that their language skills were better than average and that it influenced forming a positive linguistic identity. As Roiha (2017), the modern global world, strong multilingualism provides more opportunities for different professions. This is backed up by Crystal's (2003) thoughts on the rise of English in global academia and business. CLIL-teaching can also promote multiculturalism and awareness and tolerance to other cultures in implicit ways (Roiha, 2017). He concludes that further study on the long-term effects of CLIL-teaching is needed. CLIL-teaching has been shown by these examples to be a facilitator for ELF principles in learning and teaching and it has also seen to create globally aware citizens, as shown by Roiha's study.

Finnish teachers have been regarded as highly professional and skilled on their field. The starting point for an English teacher is of course to be a student studying the field. Mäntylä and Kalaja (2017) conducted a research with university students to investigate what kind of English class would be "the one from their dreams". In this study they interviewed 31 students and had them produce a picture of their perfect English class and through qualitative analysis they found that the classes were student centred, modern, functional, and not tied to the classroom. The findings show that the use of coursebook in these classes would be minimal and focused on meaningful learning environments (Mäntylä & Kalaja, 2017). In these classes, tasks are cooperative, and language is used as a tool for communication and situational (Mäntylä & Kalaja, 2017). These classes were found to emphasize positive atmosphere and agency of the pupils, although younger students tended to move towards the traditional sense of teacher being the provider of Information (Mäntylä & Kalaja, 2017). The length of studies was therefore seen as a relevant in these results. Mäntylä and Kalaja (2017) conclude that students want to teach a class that follows the curriculum but is focused on language being the tool for communication and situational with combining language with even other school subjects if seen relevant. Therefore, they found that students in universities learn to become teachers that follow the curriculum but are not restricted by it and treat language not as something to be taught but something to use to learn with.

Another study regarding student teachers was done by Aalto and Tarnanen (2015) with a focus on language awareness and sensitivity. According to them teacher education is in a key position to develop language sensitivity and how to influence the perceptions student teachers may have

from their own time at school. This study had 221 participants and found that students still harbour ideas from their previous school life and although they orient themselves as supportive towards the language learning of pupils, they are not prepared to help them develop language skill as part of the skills of the subject itself (Aalto & Tarnanen, 2015). What is seen as a challenge in teacher education is the development of integration of the perspectives of language and content with research in mind (Aalto & Tarnanen, 2015). They conclude that while it seems that English teacher students are aware of their role as language teachers, they mainly focus on the word-level phenomena in their teaching and language analysis, missing language sensitivity and awareness. It is important to see these two different results in studies, where the other found very positive outcomes and the other found issues in teacher training. This shows that not every course in teacher training is the same and not every student views teaching in a similar way. It should also be noted that the latter study is a few years older, so practises may have changed since, and more language aware methods have been found with students later. Language awareness is an important aspect of the ELF paradigm, as mentioned previously, so investigating students and their awareness is also very relevant and while this thesis focuses on working teachers, a point of view from future teachers is also valuable in the Finnish English teaching contexts.

Moving on from teacher students, the main context of language acquisition and learning in Finland is the context of school. Multilingualism in schools is more and more common and language is a key to learning and self-expression and opens gates to future possibilities in the working life (Mustanoja et al. 2017). In the field of linguistics, language, and the possibilities it gives with its use has been studied through the term ‘‘resource’’, as Mustanoja et al. (2017) discuss in their article. This term is quite relevant in second language or foreign language learning in the Finnish context. An example of usage of English, more specifically ELF as a resource is presented by a study by Ahlholm (2015), where she investigated how a Russian first language pupil uses English to facilitate understanding between him and his classmates in a Finnish preparatory class. The goal of the study was to investigate how the pupils relies on English in interactions between the classmates. She found that English was used as a lingua franca resource and became quite important during lessons. English became an important lexical resource for the pupil to facilitate understanding on areas where he struggled and while teachers did not answer in English, they facilitated this language use by acknowledging the speech and understanding what he said (Ahlholm, 2015). The freedom ELF provided as a resource for the pupils provided a learning environment where he felt safe and instead of the traditional thoughts

of language use in this way causing “poor English” it was something that strengthened learning in all other areas (Ahlholm, 2015). As can be seen from this example, language was used as a resource to facilitate understanding.

Resource in different context can mean different things. It can be learning itself, the target of learning, the way of learning and the result of learning (Mustanoja et al. 2017). Language as a resource thrives in authentic learning situations, where the pupils learn how language is used and how they can practice it themselves (Mustanoja et al. 2017). The meaning of authentic learning situations is emphasized in communication with different language users (Mustanoja et al. 2017). As was the case with above example, even if language skills of one speaker are weak, the support of others makes communication possible (Ahlholm, 2015; Mustanoja et al. 2017). Therefore, according to Mustanoja et al. (2017), the use of the term resource in language communication means the sharing of resources between speakers.

Another example of using language as a resource in a classroom setting can be found in the study by Kääntä (2017). In her study about L2 learners’ practices in asking for help in pronunciation during reading aloud, three techniques were found: direct requests, trying out, and aborting the reading. Kääntä (2017) argues that reading aloud provides pupils opportunities to orient to pronunciation. During these lessons, pupils could for example tune into the other’s repair techniques and facilitate the repair by helping them in the pronunciation trouble (Kääntä, 2017). English was therefore used as a resource to help the other pupil in their pronunciation. These techniques found showed different ways in which language provides a resource for learning. Peltonen (2017) also investigated language use as a resource, this time by investigating upper secondary students and how they maintain fluency collaboratively during tasks. The study examined L2 speech fluency in an interactional setting with two aspects: individual fluency and interactional fluency (Peltonen, 2017). Individual fluency means maintaining the personal flow of speech while interactional fluency means collaboration in maintaining the fluency of speech (Peltonen, 2017). The study found that other-repetitions and collaborative completions maintain fluency in these settings, other-repetitions contributing to both fluencies, and collaborative completions contributed to the latter (Peltonen, 2017). These communicative features in speech served as ways in which the speakers maintained fluent speech, or how Mustanoja et al. (2017) put it, these functions served as a resource in communication to facilitate understanding.

The final example on classroom contexts is provided by Pitkänen-Huhta (2008). Her study focused on pupils and their conversations and how they start these conversations and learn to use

English language texts. The conversations around these texts were the focus of the study. The study included seventh grade English learners, and the ethnographic study conducted showed that the pupils literacy practices that combined both English and Finnish (Pitkänen-Huhta, 2008). Literacy practices are deeper practices that happen when using different texts, deeper than reading and writing and are tied to social environments and culture (Pitkänen-Huhta, 2008). The study found that these practices were created to facilitate both schoolwork and the upkeep of their group identity, creating practices specifically for each one (Pitkänen-Huhta, 2008). English language was more present during classroom practices while mixing with Finnish happened in more informal situations, where playing with language was a key part in changing the nature of the situation from formal to informal (Pitkänen-Huhta, 2008). Pitkänen-Huhta (2008) concluded that while pupils use language in different ways during in the classroom, and the textbooks and formal nature of the classroom presents a more splintered and focused form, they actively change literacy events to achieve their personal goals in language learning (Pitkänen-Huhta, 2008). Not only is this study linked to Mustanoja et al. (2017) and their definition of language used as a resource to achieve goals, but this also relates to Kohn's (2018) social constructivist approach of language learning, where each learner creates goals that they want to achieve in language learning and become more aware of their linguistic capabilities. These examples introduced learning contexts from many different classrooms and their contexts, and all of them are relevant to the ELF paradigm in that communication is key and finding common understanding is outweighed by grammatical correctness (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019).

2.4.3 Finnish contexts of English use outside of school

Finally, I will introduce some context from English use in Finland that are outside of the school context. As Crystal (2003) has said, English has spread across many mediums, and Finland is not an exception to this rule. For example, during free time English is used by children for example during video game sessions. Piirainen-Marsh (2008) conducted a study investigating this phenomenon and found that code-switching during gaming sessions is an important method where the participants make sense of complex multimodal situations. Paakkinen (2008), studied instead advertisements in Finland and how English is presented in them. She found that English has many purposes in Finnish ads which include information, trendiness and internationality and it fills and adds meaning to Finnish ads. English in these ads was made very easy to understand by watchers, and the study found that people watching these ads do not end up paying

attention to the language of the ad (Paakkinen, 2008). English was a neutral enough language that it caters to many different audiences (Paakkinen, 2008).

Sports interviews was studied by Koskela (2008), including interviews done by Finnish reporters with athletes from outside of Finland. There was not found a single correct way to speak English on Finnish TV, and the second language communication between the participants was communication oriented (Koskela, 2008). This meant not paying attention to linguistic problems, content being more important than speech and the language was used as a resource in the professional environment (Koskela, 2008). This example is great in showcasing that ELF communication is present in sports interviews by nature without specific focus on it. The findings of this study support ELF principles and ways of communication and provide very good insight on the global nature of sporting events in the modern world. Final example of a Finnish context where English is seen as an important is the field of business and entrepreneurship.

Virkkula (2008) investigated Finnish business contexts and found that English is needed almost daily in Finnish companies, especially in the higher ups of the company. ELF is seen as an important method of communication in companies and English is an important part of professional skills in business (Virkkula, 2008). As mentioned in previous sections about anxiety in school context by for example Ghonsooly et al. (2014), this issue is also found in the business world with people who feel that their English skills are not up to par with others (Virkkula, 2008). This leads to issues of power with English, with English skilled applicants being possibly chosen over others who are not as skilled in English but may be just as or even more qualified otherwise (Virkkula, 2008). Virkkula (2008) concludes that ELF speech should be taken into consideration in oral training, this language training and awareness in companies is important, and that English in the working life is here to stay in Finland. English is also not used in any one certain way but is used differently depending on the context, highlighting the ELF aspects of the language use (Virkkula, 2008).

Heimonen and Ylönen (2017) on the other hand, conducted a study investigating university staff and how they see the use of English and its importance. The findings showed that across all disciplines of universities, were overwhelmingly positive towards other languages than English as well. Even though English has become the undeniable language of academia, it is a positive thing to find that despite of its importance, English is not the only foreign language promoted in university. These different contexts show that English has become a common and

global language in the Finnish society as a whole and shows how important learning English in a global perspective is in the modern world.

3 Methodology

In this section I will introduce the research methodologies used in the research that I conducted, starting with introducing the reasons for choosing a qualitative research over a quantitative after which the research angle, phenomenography, is introduced. These two topics are the outline of the conducted research itself, guiding the ways in which it was both conducted and how it was analyzed. The method of analysis itself is introduced in a later section which describes the research itself.

3.1 Qualitative research

The nature of this study was easy to decide based on the topic I have chosen. The study will be qualitative study, since it has to do with humans and their thoughts, and since this study aims to answer the question ‘‘what’’, the choice of a qualitative research was an easy one to make (Lichtman 2013). Qualitative study deals with subjectivity and authentic human experience, being one of the dominant paradigms of the field of qualitative research (Silverman, 2017). My thesis discusses human experiences and perceptions in the form of English teachers, yet again showing that qualitative study is better suited for this thesis. Quantitative methods are usually more suited to investigate social facts or causes of some phenomenon, while qualitative study investigates how social phenomena arise in the interactions of the participants (Silverman, 2017). Data collection, analysis and writing are essential in qualitative research and these aspects of research are in the centre of my research in this thesis (Silverman, 2017). Human experiences and perceptions are unique to everyone, and from the start qualitative methods have felt more suitable, and with further reading and study, it was a simple choice to make in the end.

3.2 Phenomenography

I have chosen phenomenography as my methodology for this study. This methodology suits this topic well, since phenomenography means describing different phenomena and it investigates the perceptions people have of said phenomena (Ahonen, 1994). These perceptions are always different for every person both in their content and their quality because experiences are required to developing these perceptions (Ahonen, 1994). Phenomenography is designed to an-

swer questions about thinking and learning (Marton, Sherman & Webb, 1986). Since my research will be on the field of education, for which phenomenography was developed as a framework for, choosing it as a methodology felt appropriate as well (Marton, Sherman & Webb, 1986). Phenomenography is also concerned about the subjective individual, which involves feelings, perceptions, and thinking (Niikko, 2003). Phenomenography also focuses on people's experiences of a phenomenon instead of the phenomenon itself, which suits the nature of this research very well (Cossham, 2017). In my study I will investigate the perceptions of teachers and how those perceptions and experiences have developed their understanding of global English. In other words, in my study, as in phenomenography in general, the subjects of study are the differences in people's perceptions (Ahonen, 1994). This methodology is very interesting due to it investigating people's perceptions. People assume that their own perceptions are correct and real and assumes others think the same way while these perceptions can differ in major ways (Häkkinen 1996). The analysis and interpretation of research material is very important in phenomenography and the generation of its theory, meaning that the researcher should focus on the data they collect and how they can create a theory from that instead of working with previously known theories (Ahonen, 1994). Therefore, in my research process, I separated the data collection and theory as much as possible and started writing my theory only after all my data was collected and I had read through them a few times. This was done to ensure that the results and analysis that I would do on the data would not be affected by the theory I had read, and that the chosen theory would in turn be chosen based on the collected data. Discussing the results of the research from the point of view of phenomenography is going to provide interesting ideas and differences in the perceptions and experiences that the participants of this research will express. These results will be discussed in the concluding parts of the thesis.

4 Research

This research was conducted as a qualitative phenomenographical study, where the aim was to investigate the perceptions and experiences of Finnish English teachers. The participants come from various backgrounds, which will be further discussed in the next section. The questions asked in the study were formed in such a way that the respondent can give as detailed of an answer they desire. Although phenomenography usually deals with data collected from in person interviews, in my opinion an open-ended questionnaire can serve the methodology nearly as well (Marton, Sherman & Webb, 1986). Details of the data collection method will be discussed in a section below. The questions were also designed based on the preliminary research questions that I had come up with earlier. These questions have since slightly changed to reflect the data that was collected. The phenomenon of English as a lingua franca was described with the term “English as a global language” or “global English” (GE) to simplify the questionnaire and make it as easy to understand as possible. One of the reasons for choosing questionnaires for the research was also the current world events at the time of writing this thesis. The corona pandemic has increased the workload of teachers and given them less time than usual, so setting up interviews in person or online would become very challenging if not impossible. By using questionnaires, the possibilities for participation will be higher, which is why this method of data collection was ultimately chosen.

4.1 Participants

To make my analysis relevant to a certain context, I chose to investigate only Finnish teachers since their perceptions can have similarities because people experience these perceptions in their context (Häkkinen 1996). In this way an English teacher from Germany and Finland will probably have very differing views on global English due to their different context and culture. Choosing to focus on Finnish teachers gives me a more accurate view of the Finnish context, even if the individual perceptions of the teachers are still developed in their own respective school contexts.

The total number of participants in this study comes to a total of 18 teachers. Most of the answers come from a Facebook group made for English teachers called “Englannin opettajat” that has currently over 4000 members (4082 at the time of writing this section). I also sent the research form to teachers that I have been working with in the past, these teachers may have also sent the form forward causing snowball sampling in the responses as well. This however

cannot be verified since the study is completely anonymous. The participants were asked five preliminary questions to find out their background as teachers to give some additional insight. These questions were gender, age, teaching experience by years, where they are teaching and if they have any previous experience with global English/English as a lingua franca. Most of the participants identified as female (16) and only a couple as male (2). The ages of the participants vary a lot more, around a third (33.3%) of them being between 41-50, 27.8% between 31-40, 22.2% 25-30 and three age groups at 5.6% them being less than 25, 51-60 and over 60-years old.

Teaching experience of the teachers also had a lot of variation. 44.4% of the teachers had less than five years of teaching experience, 27.8% had 11-20 years of experience, two groups had 11.1% them being 5-10 years and 21-30 years. Finally, only one teacher (5, 6%) had over 30 years of teaching experience. The participants of the study are therefore rather inexperienced teachers.

The biggest variation in the participants of this study come from the teaching positions of the participants. The two largest groups with 27.8% are elementary school teachers (grades 3-6) and teacher who work in both elementary and secondary schools (both grades 3-6 and 7-9). The second largest group consisting of 16.7% of the participants are purely secondary school (grades 7-9) teachers. There were then multiple single answers (5.6%) from different teaching positions. These include a high school teacher, both a secondary school and high school teacher, a folk high school teacher, a teacher from a university of applied sciences and a teacher currently working in elementary school but previous experience in secondary school. The diversity of the participants in terms of their teaching positions are a welcome addition, since that will hopefully provide more diverse points of view in terms of global English/English as a lingua franca. The final preliminary question of the participants' experience of global English/English as a lingua franca was unanimous. All the participants have previous experience in global English/English as a lingua franca in one way or another. This will benefit the results of the study greatly, since all participants can share their experiences instead of providing hypothetical answers. The data collection process is discussed in the next section, where the structure of the research form is discussed in more detail.

4.2 Data collection

The data used for this research was collected through using open ended questionnaires with three different themes. The platform used for this questionnaire was Google Forms due to the familiarity with Google products and simple nature of the forms, making them easier to read and answer. Google Forms also separates answers and divides them automatically, making the process simpler and easier for the researcher. For smaller scale studies and questionnaires Google Forms is quite suitable. Providing easy to use tools for people conducting their first studies. The questionnaire included a total of nine questions in the three themes. The first theme of the questionnaire is called ‘‘Global English as a phenomenon in school’’ (Global English is used as the terms of choice to make the questionnaire as simple as possible to understand). This theme consists of two questions:

1. What experiences and/or perceptions do you have of the phenomenon ‘‘English as a global language’’ in general?’’
2. What experiences and /or perceptions do you have of ‘‘English as a global language’’ as a phenomenon in the school context?

These two questions were designed to provide basic ideas and perceptions teachers have about global English/English as a lingua franca in and outside of the school context without discussing their personal contexts specifically. The first question aims to specifically find out general perceptions about the phenomenon around the world and in Finland, while the second focuses on its implications in the school context both in Finland and other countries.

The second theme of the questionnaire focuses on the teachers’ personal contexts and is called ‘‘personal experiences in the school context’’. This theme is seen as the most important of the study and therefore includes the most questions, a total of five:

1. How has English as a global language been included in your teaching?
2. What benefits can global English have in the context of school in your opinion and how can it be used the most effectively?
3. How can English as a global language have positive impact on the learning of pupils?
4. What kind of problems do you see in global English and how could these problems be solved or prevented?
5. How can English as a global language have negative impact on the learning of pupils?

The first question wants to find out the experiences of teachers about using global English/English as a lingua franca in their personal teaching. The second and third questions seek for perceptions about the benefits and positive aspects of global English/English as a lingua franca in the school context and directly in the learning of pupils. The fourth and fifth questions seek the opposite, the possible negative perceptions, or experiences about the phenomenon. These five questions delve into the personal contexts of the participants and aim to find a general overview on the experiences and perceptions of teachers in the different levels of English teaching in the Finnish school system.

The final theme of the questionnaire is named “In the future” and focuses on what is to come in the upcoming years in the field of English teaching and English as a global language. The sections have two questions:

1. How do you think English teaching will change in the coming years?
2. What kind of a role do you think English as a global language has in the future in both the teaching and around the world?

These final questions seek answers to teachers’ perceptions on the future developments of English in their own teaching context and in general around the world. These questions raise awareness of the teachers to the future of English and aims to bring up new ideas and thoughts basing on the previous sections and the thoughts they may have provoked in the participant. As can be seen overall, the questions in all sections of the questionnaire are quite general and broad. This is done on purpose to both give a more general look into the perceptions and experiences of teachers, so further research can be done later on specific aspects of this study and to give the participants as much freedom and space to bring out their own thoughts. Too specific questions could divert the participant to answer in a certain way or give certain answers. The only specifics asked in the study were about the positive and negative aspects of the phenomenon, to ensure that there are ideas from both the positive and negative side. These questions were also still designed to be as open as possible to avoid too much direction in the answers. The risk in having such open questions is that the participants give very short answers that have little substance to them. However, the nature of the study being a phenomenography requires the answers to be as free as possible and the form of a questionnaire with open ended thematic questions is the most appropriate way to conduct a questionnaire in such a way. The results of the study will be discussed in the next section.

4.3 Method of analysis

According to Rapley (2016), it is important to go ‘‘step-by-step’’ when analyzing qualitative data and that even though there are differences in the methods of analysis, they all have the common goal of seeking to discover, explore and create connections and patterns that are hidden in the data. In his chapter he discusses many different methods of analyzing qualitative data, one of them being thematic analysis. In thematic analysis, the researcher first familiarizes themselves with the data they have collected, then generates the first codes from the data, searches for themes in said codes and finally reviews and refines the themes that they have generated from the data (Rapley, 2016). I have chosen thematic analysis to support the methodology of phenomenography. In thematic analysis the researcher first generates codes from the data. (Braun & Clarke, 2006). After the coding of data in a way that is meaningful and relevant to the subject of the study, the themes are created from these codes by grouping similar codes together (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Rapley (2016) says that it is very important to read and code your data in a systematic manner and with great precision. The codes created can originate from the theory you have read or the data itself and it is important to reflect and change them if necessary. (Rapley, 2016). It is also important to focus on the key codes that you have created and on the relationships that these codes have with each other by making judgements about which of them are central to the research and looking for links, patterns, associations etc. (Rapley, 2016). For this research, the codes were created from the data itself, with a framework for creating the themes came from the theory and research questions. The data dictated the number of themes and what the themes ended up being.

Thematic analysis consists of six phases: 1) familiarizing yourself with the data 2) generating initial codes 3) searching for themes 4) reviewing themes 5) defining and naming themes, and 6) producing the report (Braun & Clarke, 2006). During coding, attention should be given to every part of the data equally, and then group similar codes together as a single code that describes the ideas in a clear way (Braun & Clarke, 2006). After coding, grouping codes together to make themes can be done (Braun & Clarke, 2006). These themes can be larger main, or as described in this research, primary themes, or sub themes (described as secondary themes in this research) (Braun & Clarke, 2006). After creating initial themes, it is important to review them and change them if necessary, to make them as relevant to the data as possible (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Next, I will describe an example of my data collection process, which is based on the above example by Braun and Clarke (2006). I will use one answer from the data set as an example of codification and creation of themes:

I want to teach English as a global language, and I emphasize to my pupils that there is no one correct way to use English and that every variety of English is equally valuable. I have also pondered this topic in my own thesis specifically from the point of view of pronunciation and oral linguistic skills.’’

’’Haluan itse opettaa englantia globaalina kielenä ja painotan oppilailleni, ettei ole yhtä oikeaa tapaa käyttää englantia vaan että juurikin kaikki variaatiot ovat yhtä arvokkaita. Olen myös omassa gradussani pohtinut aihetta erityisesti ääntämisen ja suullisen kielitaidon näkökulmasta.’’

From this piece of data, multiple codes can be identified. The phrases found relevant in this piece of data are: ‘‘I want to teach English as a global language’’, ‘‘I emphasise to my pupils that every variety of English is valuable’’, and ‘‘I pondered this topic in my own thesis from the point of view of pronunciation and oral linguistic skills’’. These three codes are all clearly different from one another, so they do not join as a single code. If we were to create a theme from these single codes, we could do it somehow like this:

1. ‘‘I want to teach English as a global language’’ = teacher’s motivation, would become a part of a theme called ‘‘Perceptions/experiences of teaching global English’’.
2. ‘‘I emphasise to my pupils that every variety of English is valuable’’ = goals in pupil confidence, would become a part of a theme called ‘‘Perceptions/experiences of awareness and confidence of global English’’.
3. ‘‘I pondered this topic in my own thesis from the point of view of pronunciation and oral linguistic skills’’ = global English in previous studies, would become a part of a theme called ‘‘Perceptions/experiences of global English as a phenomenon’’.

As can be seen from the results of this thesis, more levels of codes were created than just the one presented above. This was done out of necessity to simplify and make the codes more readable and understandable to the reader. The principles in making these two levels of codes are the same as above, bringing together similar codes to make a broader code that describes them all together. The creation of these two levels of codes were the most meaningful way to

present the data in a way that would be of the most service to the data itself. In the next section the results of this research are described and the themes and codes withing them are opened.

5 Results

After analyzing the data of 18 participating teachers according to the methods of thematic analysis as described before, a total of nine themes were found and created from the dataset. Four of these themes can be called primary themes due to their relevance and size, while five of them are smaller secondary themes that did not fit the other themes or created a large enough data sample to become its own theme. The four primary themes of this research are: Perceptions/experiences of global English as a phenomenon, perceptions/experiences about positive impacts of global English in school, perceptions/experiences about negatives of global English in school, and perceptions on the development of English in the future. These four themes yielded the largest number of codes and different data. The five secondary themes are: perceptions/experiences of global English as a tool, perceptions/experiences of teaching global English, perceptions/experiences of awareness and confidence in global English, perceptions/experiences of global English in existing teaching materials, and perceptions/experiences on pupils' and their English use. These themes were very relevant but yielded less unique codes or included many similar answers by the participants. The breakdown of primary and secondary themes in the context of this research means that the primary themes were more general and applicable to many codes, while the secondary themes are more precise and are relevant to certain codes. This means that the secondary codes are the most relevant part of the data set due to them being created from codes on very specific topics. In upcoming sections I will discuss each theme starting from the primary, more general themes and ending with the more detailed secondary themes.

5.1 Primary themes

Each theme starts out with a level one coding which include general codes found in the data and level two codes that elaborate on the first level codes. This way people reading the study can get as detailed description of the codes as possible. Tables of each themes were created to illustrate the development of the themes and codes in the data set. The tables also include examples from the research data to further clarify the codes and the theme itself.

5.1.1 Perceptions and experiences on global English as a phenomenon

As table 1 shows, there are a total of eight level one codes found on the theme ‘perceptions/experiences of global English (henceforth GE) as a phenomenon’. These codes are: 1) global communication 2) Lingua franca perspectives 3) Superiority of Br and Am English 4) European English 5) GE in Finland 6) GE in different contexts 7) GE in everyday life and 8) GE in previous studies. The first code, global communication, further includes the level two codes of ‘international communication’ and ‘common connecting language’. These codes represent the conceptions of English as a tool for communication globally and how English is used as a connecting language between many people from different backgrounds. The participants described for example how GE is a useful tool for communication everywhere in the world and they highlighted the importance of English as a mean of communication in international communication and that it is great to have a connecting language between different people. The second level one code ‘lingua franca perspectives’ includes the level 2 codes ‘principles of ELF’ and ‘intelligibility of speech’. These codes, as can be seen, have to do with the perceptions and experiences of the participants that coincide with the theory and practices of English as a lingua franca or ‘ELF’. These ideas include thoughts of seeing English as the lingua franca between non-native speakers of English, that there is no ‘one real’ English and that understandability in speech comes before the form and grammatical correctness of the content that is spoken. One of the participants described GE as a phenomenon this way:

‘‘My own perception on English language is that for many it is not only a first language but that it is most of all used as a lingua franca between different first language speakers. Often the situation with English users can be that no one uses English as their first language in the current communicative situation. That is why I think it is important that despite of their background and first language, English users should aim to understand each other and get their message across.’’

‘‘Oma näkemykseni englannin kielestä on, että se on paitsi monelle englannin kielen käyttäjälle äidinkieli niin myös ennen kaikkea sitä käytetään lingua francan roolissa äidinkieleltään erikielisten kesken. Usein tilanne englannin kieltä käyttävillä voi olla se, että kukaan vuorovaikutustilanteessa ei puhu englantia äidinkielenään. Siksi on tärkeää mielestäni se, että taustastaan ja äidinkielestään huolimatta englantia käyttäjät pyrkivät ymmärtämään toisiaan

ja saamaan oman viestinsä perille’’ – woman, age 41-50, 11-20 years of teaching experience in elementary and lower secondary schools.

This reply describes the second code perfectly. The participant expresses her opinion that on top of English being the mother tongue of many people, it is also used as a lingua franca by non-native speakers of English. She also says that often English is used by people in situations where there is no native speakers present at all and because of that it is important that all people regardless of their backgrounds and first language English speakers should aim to understand each other and get their message across.

The third code of the first theme, ‘‘superiority of Br and Am English’’ includes level two codes ‘‘influence of the US’’ and ‘‘Br and Am English ‘‘better’’’’. These codes show the perceptions the participants have made from the surrounding world, saying for example that the USA’s influence is large due to the prevalence of pop culture in the western world and that in many places the UK and USA are still seen as the only source of pure language. The fourth code ‘‘European English’’ is a smaller code that includes the level two code ‘‘European English as a term’’. This code represents the mentioning of the term European English by a participant, meaning English spoken by Europeans in Europe. The fifth level one code ‘‘GE in Finland’’ describes the Finnish context of GE use. It includes the level two codes ‘‘Finnish accent inferior’’, ‘‘grammar oriented’’ and ‘‘English used widely’’. These codes represent the participants’ perceptions on how Finnish people see their English use and how English is treated in the Finnish context. Examples from the data include thoughts that the Finnish accent is seen as ‘‘dumb’’ or ‘‘junttimaisena’’ while other accents like Italian are seen as endearing or cute. The participants also said that Finnish views on English are still quite grammar oriented and that English has also taken the role of third spoken language in some places, such as Helsinki and Espoo for example.

The sixth and seventh code have to do with GE in different contexts. The name of the sixth is appropriately ‘‘GE in different contexts’’ and includes codes ‘‘gaming’’, ‘‘academia’’, ‘‘professional life’’ and ‘‘international events’’. As can be guessed, these codes describe the different contexts the participants identified where GE is used often. Games connect people globally, English is the language of academia and higher education, English was necessary in their previous profession and international events may have no native speakers present are all examples from the data that the participants discussed in their answers. The seventh code is a specific

one: ‘‘GE in everyday life’’. This code specifies two more codes: ‘‘home and work’’ and ‘‘present constantly’’. The participants described how they use English mixed with Finnish in their normal everyday life and how some of them work or used to work in an environment that was completely international. English is also part of their lives constantly in some cases. The final code of the first theme, ‘‘GE in previous studies’’ is separated into ‘‘master’s studies’’ and ‘‘thesis’’. Some of the participants had worked with the phenomenon of ELF previously either during their master’s level studies in university or their own thesis.

Theme	First coding	Second coding	Examples of data
Perceptions/experiences of GE as a phenomenon	1) Global communication	1) <i>international communication, common connecting language</i>	GE useful tool for communication everywhere, role as a mean of communication highlighted
	2) Lingua franca perspectives	2) <i>principles of ELF, intelligibility of speech</i>	Lingua franca between non-natives, no one “real English, Understandability before form
	3) Superiority of Br and Am English	3) <i>Influence of the US, Br and Am English “better”</i>	USA’s influence through pop culture, UK and USA seen as the only source of pure language
	4) European English	4) <i>European English as a term</i>	English between Europeans called European English
	5) GE in Finland	5) <i>Finnish accent inferior, grammar oriented, English used widely</i>	Italian accent seen as cute, Finnish as “dumb”, nationwide issue, too attached to grammar, already a third language in some places
	6) GE in different contexts	6) <i>Gaming, academia, professional life, international events</i>	Games connect globally, language of academia, necessary in previous profession, no natives in international events
	7) GE in everyday life	7) <i>Home and work, present constantly</i>	English mixed with Finnish in everyday, present all the time
	8) GE in previous studies	8) <i>Master’s studies, thesis</i>	GE topic in thesis, GE discussed during master’s studies

Table 1: Perceptions/experiences of GE as a phenomenon

5.1.2 Perceptions and experiences about positive impacts of global English in school

The second primary theme of the research, ‘‘perceptions/experiences about positive impacts of GE in school’’ includes a total of six different level one codes. These codes are: 1) motivation to learn 2) GE as a way of learning 3) Teacher’s thoughts of GE 4) Future implications for pupils 5) GE as a model for interculturalism and finally 6) Classroom environment. These codes are related to the perceptions of the participants that have to do with the general positive things they thought GE provides in the context of school.

The first level one code of this theme is called ‘‘motivation to learn’’ and it divides into level two codes of ‘‘motivation from GE’’, ‘‘interest of pupils’’ and ‘‘feeling of success’’. Examples from the data show answers like that GE motivates pupils to learn English, find the diverse source of information, and communicate in English. Also, pupils especially interested in English are very interested in GE and that GE provides feelings of success to pupils. Going from motivation to learn to actual learning, the second level one code is called ‘‘GE as a way of learning’’ and it includes the codes ‘‘meaningfulness’’, ‘‘realism’’, ‘‘broader thinking’’, ‘‘humor’’, ‘‘written skills’’, ‘‘reading and listening’’, ‘‘different focus’’ and ‘‘varieties’’. There are many level two codes due to the many ways the participants perceived GE to be positive in terms of learning. These things included ideas such as GE providing meaningful learning, giving a more realistic picture of language use, expands thinking outside of the classroom and that the different varieties of English can be humorous when discussed and used in class. GE was also seen to be relevant in written skills and both reading and listening comprehension. One major positive focus that the participants found was that GE focuses on other things than grammar that has previously been shown to be something that Finnish people in general tend to focus on in English use. The third level one code ‘‘Teacher’s thoughts of GE’’ divides into two codes, ‘‘common knowledge’’ and ‘‘positive view on GE’’. Of these two codes, the latter one was expressed by most of the participants, saying that they found no explicit bad things in GE. One participant also expressed that GE should be ‘‘common knowledge’’.

Returning to pupils, the fourth level one code, ‘‘Future implications for pupils’’ has two level two codes. These codes are ‘‘future planning’’ and ‘‘preparation for life’’. According to the participants, GE has the possibility to boost the future plans of the pupils and prepare them

better for the real-life situations for example in their professional life or when travelling around the world. This relates to the fifth level one code, “GE as a model for interculturalism”. This code then separates into “multiculturalism”, “tolerance and openness”, “equality and belonging” and “inclusion”. As the codes suggest, the participants see that GE promotes multiculturalism, tolerance and openness. It also helps pupils feel more included in school and provides feelings of equality and belonging. One participant expresses her thoughts like this:

“It helps every student to belong in the group. No one is valued higher due to their parents, place of living or day care making it possible to learn a certain accent”

“Se auttaa jokaista oppilasta kuulumaan joukkoon. Ketään ei arvoteta ylemmäksi vain siitä syystä, että vanhemmat, asuinpaikka tai päivähoito on mahdollistanut tietynlaisen murteen oppimisen.” – woman, age 31–40, 5–10 years of experience in elementary school

She explains that GE helps pupils to feel included and that no one is valued higher due to their parents, place where they live, or day care provided them with an opportunity to learn a certain accent or dialect. This reply provides a good example on the code and how it can manifest itself in the real world. This leads to the sixth and final code, “classroom environment” that consists of level two codes called “more space in speech”, “acceptance and respect of speech” and “positive attitude”. These codes can relate to the answer discussed previously as well. Examples from the data also include providing more space for personal pronunciation, acceptance and respect for personal speech, the unnecessary of shame in personal accent and positive attitudes in class. As can be seen, the previous answer highlighted also represents the ideas from this code and many other participants expressed similar thoughts as well. These six codes give a general view on the positives of GE in the context of school. The upcoming secondary codes will provide more insight on other more specific positives that can be included in the phenomenon of GE. Table 2 below shows the theme discussed previously in its entirety.

Theme	First coding	Second coding	Examples of data
Perceptions/experiences about positive impacts of GE in school	<p>1) Motivation to learn</p> <p>2) GE as a way of learning</p> <p>3) Teacher's thoughts of GE</p> <p>4) Future implications for pupils</p> <p>5) GE as a model for interculturalism</p> <p>6) Classroom environment</p>	<p>1) <i>Motivation from GE, Interest of pupils, feeling of success</i></p> <p>2) <i>meaningfulness, realism, broader thinking, humour, written skills, reading and listening, different focus, varieties</i></p> <p>3) <i>Common knowledge, positive view on GE</i></p> <p>4) <i>Future planning, preparation for life</i></p> <p>5) <i>Multiculturalism, tolerance and openness, equality and belonging, inclusion</i></p> <p>6) <i>More space in speech, acceptance and respect of speech, positive attitude</i></p>	<p>GE motivates: to learn English, to find the diverse source of information, and communicate, pupils interested of language like GE, provides feelings of success to pupils</p> <p>Provides meaningful learning, gives a more realistic picture of use, expands thinking outside of the classroom, relevant in written skills, helps in reading and listening comprehension, focuses on other parts than grammar</p> <p>Have no problems with GE, GE should be common knowledge</p> <p>Boosts future plans of pupils, prepares for the real life (work, travel etc.)</p> <p>GE valuable for multiculturalism. increases tolerance and openness, increases equality and feelings of belonging</p> <p>Acceptance and respect for personal speech, no need to feel shame for personal accents, positive attitudes in class</p>

Table 2: Perceptions/experiences about positives of GE in school

5.1.3 Perceptions and experiences of the negatives of global English in school

After discussing the positives that GE can provide in the school context, it seems appropriate to discuss the negatives as well. The third primary theme ‘‘perceptions/experiences of the negatives of GE in school’’ includes eight different level one codes: 1) difficulties in teaching GE 2) confusion of pupils 3) lack of structure 4) Pupils’ attitudes 5) Differences in pupils linguistic competence 6) Ignorance of GE 7) Power of English and 8) Possible issues with school and teachers. These codes show the perceptions and experiences that the participant may have about GE and its possible negative impacts in the school context.

The first level one code in this theme is ‘‘difficulties in teaching GE’’ and it divides into the two codes of ‘‘what to teach and how?’’ and ‘‘phonetics and grammar’’. The examples from the data include thoughts about how to encourage pronunciation practicing without choosing a certain variety to practice, what kind of English should even be taught? The lines between GE and Standard English are also pondered and that phonetics and spelling are based on certain accents so if free pronunciation is encouraged, these may be difficult for pupils to learn. The latest point is related to the second code, ‘‘confusion of pupils’’. This includes level two codes of ‘‘many variations’’ and ‘‘need for instruction’’. The participants raise concerns of possible confusion too many variations could have on especially young pupils, who need clear goals and instruction. This need for clarity leads into the third code of ‘‘lack of structure’’. ‘‘Problems with absence of rules’’ and ‘‘poorer language’’ are the level two codes that are linked with this code. According to some participants, with no clear structure and rules, the spoken language changes into something other than English, the language levels of pupils can become ‘‘poorer’’ due to focus on intelligibility instead of native-level English. Deficient language skills and ‘‘broken English’’ also came up in the data. One of the participants discussed the issues of GE like this:

‘‘If native level English is not the goal and the aim is not to develop language in a specific grammatical direction, but instead the focus is on understandable communication, language will inevitably become poorer. It is important that pupils hear enough grammar oriented so called pure English.’’

‘‘Jos äidinkielen omaiseen englantiin ei pyritä ja kieltä ei pyritä kehittämään tietynlaiseen, kieliopillisesti oikeaan suuntaan, vaan keskitytään ainoastaan ymmärrettävään

kommunikaatioon, tulee kieli väistämättä köyhtymään. On tärkeää, että oppilaat kuulevat tarpeeksi kielioppien mukaista, ns. puhdasta englantia.” – woman, age 31–40, 5–10 years of experience in elementary school

In this answer she expresses her opinions and clearly explains why GE can have negative effects on pupils. She discusses that the language will become inevitably ‘poorer’ with GE and that it is important for pupils to hear enough so called ‘pure English’ to be able to communicate effectively. Only focusing on intelligibility in communication will not provide the level of English she feels is the best.

The fourth code, ‘pupils’ attitudes’ divides into these level two codes: ‘negative attitude to learning’, ‘too relaxed about learning’, ‘regrets in later life’ and ‘racism’. From the participants it can be gathered that with GE some pupils may feel like they ‘don’t need to know anything’ if they are speaking GE and they could question grammar rules. GE may also lead into more lax writing and vocabulary and feelings that ‘Rally English’ is good enough and that they do not need to learn ‘flawless English’. Some pupils may also regret in later life that they did not study more in school when they see how global the world has become. One issue a participant brought up is that when discussing different varieties of English around the world, some pupils may show racism in the classroom by laughing or making fun of the speakers and accents.

The fifth code deals with linguistic skills, ‘differences in pupils’ linguistic competence’ divides into ‘wanting to learn Standard English’, ‘goals too low’, ‘differentiation’ and ‘feelings of weaker pupils’. From the answers the participants bring up that some pupils may want to learn Br or Am English and that some high skilled pupils may feel that the goals set by GE are too low for them. On the other side of the spectrum, weaker pupils may feel sad due to having to learn about so many varieties of English and the necessity of English in life. This means that more differentiation would be needed in GE focused teaching, according to the participants. The sixth code, ‘ignorance of English’ splits into ‘exclusion of GE’ and ‘alienation from Standard English’. These codes mean that GE is excluded from teaching and not considered enough or at all and that speakers of GE may become alienated in countries where the focus is still on Standard English. This leads into the seventh code ‘power of English’ where the level two codes of ‘enforcement of English’ and ‘impact on other languages’ is established. The participants say that English cannot be enforced over other languages and that

over enforcing it has a negative impact on these languages. The participants see other languages as important as well, despite being English teachers.

The eighth and final code, ‘possible issues with school and teachers’ divides into three codes: ‘inexperience of the teacher, ‘attitude of teachers’ and ‘time in school’. One participant expressed worry about her ability to teach other varieties of English other than the one she spoke. Other worries that came up from the answers were the possible negative attitude of the teacher and that school does not have the time to teach all the different varieties of English that exist.

This theme provided general worries that the participants have about the use of GE. These issues may be something that teacher must face if they are teaching GE and something they need to solve. The table depicting this theme and its codes can be seen below.

Theme	First coding	Second coding	Examples of data
Perceptions/experiences of the negatives of GE in school	1) Difficulties of teaching GE	1) <i>What to teach and how? phonetics and grammar</i>	How to encourage practising pronunciation without choosing a variety? Phonetics and spelling based on accents and with GE student difficulties
	2) Confusion of pupils	2) <i>many variations, need for instruction</i>	Too many variations confuse young students need clear goals and instructions,
	3) Lack of structure	3) <i>problems with absence of rules, poorer language</i>	With no rules something else than English is spoken, level of language will ‘become poorer’ due to GE focus, ‘broken English’
	4) Pupils’ attitudes	4) <i>negative attitude to learning, too relaxed about learning, regrets in later life, racism</i>	‘No need to know anything’, questioning of grammar rules, lazy writing and vocabulary, ‘rally English’ good enough, regrets in the future, racism in class
	5) Differences in pupils’ linguistic competence	5) <i>Wanting to learn standard English, goals too low, differentiation, feelings of weaker pupils</i>	
	6) Ignorance of GE	6) <i>Exclusion of GE, alienation from standard English</i>	
		7) <i>Enforcement of English, impact</i>	

	<p>7) Power of English</p> <p>8) Possible issues with school and teachers</p>	<p><i>on other languages</i></p> <p>8) <i>Inexperience of teacher, attitude of teachers, time in school</i></p>	<p>Some want to learn Br or Am English, goals not high enough for some, weaker students' sadness, more differentiation</p> <p>GE rarely taken into consideration, alienation ins SE countries</p> <p>Cannot enforce English over other languages, negative impact on other languages</p> <p>Teacher is inexperience, negative attitudes of teacher, school cannot teach all varieties</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Table 3: Perceptions/experiences of the negatives of GE in school

5.1.4 Perceptions on the development of English in the future

The final primary theme, ‘‘perceptions on the development of English in the future’’ is a theme created from codes having to do with the future of English and GE in both generally in the world and in education. Some codes on other languages than English were also found to fit inside this theme. The level one codes of this theme are: 1) development of English as a global language 2) development of languages other than English 3) development of English communication, and 4) Development of English teaching.

The first level two codes of the code ‘‘development of English as a global language’’ are: ‘‘Status as global language’’, ‘‘power in the EU’’, ‘‘English as a tool’’, ‘‘use in professional life’’, and ‘‘status of Br and Am English’’. Many participants expressed perceptions where English either already is a global language and that will not change, that the power of English will grow, or that the growth of English will be to the detriment to other languages. Perceptions on the power of English possibly going down due to leaving the EU were also brought up. Overall English was also seen to be an important language in communication moving forward. English

would be used more in professional life, such as in companies and business. Some thought that Br or Am English will still be the starting point for English speech though.

The second code relates to the previous one in an interesting way. ‘Development of languages other than English’ have three additional level two codes, ‘status of Spanish’, ‘power of French and German’ and ‘other languages’. Some participants brought up ideas that other languages will grow alongside English, such as Spanish and due to the UK leaving the EU, French and German would possibly see growth as well in the EU. Some also thought that other languages would rise alongside English.

The third code, ‘development of English communication’ inhibits level two codes named ‘ELF principles in future communication’, ‘diversity of language’, and ‘flexibility’. These codes represent answer relating to the increase of ELF ideals and principles in future English use, such as more focus on understandability, seeing more Englishes as ‘the correct’ way to speak, and focus on authentic language use. Additionally, diversity of English language will increase, and people will become more flexible in communication in English.

Finally, the fourth code of ‘development of English teaching’ consists of four second level codes: ‘teaching of GE’, ‘amount and time of teaching’, ‘technology in teaching’, and ‘changes in education’. Many different ideas and perceptions were found in these codes, such as having GE taught more as the goals in teaching, English teaching will increase a lot and start earlier, more English language schools will come up, and that differentiation between pupils will increase even more. Technology and its development were also mentioned many times, in ways such as having more digital materials and online teaching, robots used as communication partners, and more international projects through both in-person and online communication. Finally, perceptions like opening English learning earlier, ‘home internationality’, curriculum changes, exporting of education and separating second language English and A-level EFL English were expressed as changes that will affect schools in the future. This theme explored the perceptions of the participants in the development of English in the future. Below is presented the table including the codes of this specific theme.

Theme	First coding	Second coding	Examples of data
Perceptions on the development of English in the future	<p>1) Development of English as a global language</p> <p>2) Development of languages other than English</p> <p>3) Development of English communication</p> <p>4) Development of English teaching</p>	<p>1) <i>Status as global language, power in the EU, English as a tool, use in professional life, status of Br and Am English</i></p> <p>2) <i>Status of Spanish, power of French and German, other languages</i></p> <p>3) <i>ELF principles in future communication, diversity of language, flexibility</i></p> <p>4) <i>Teaching of GE, amount and time of teaching, technology in teaching, changes in education</i></p>	<p>Already a global language and will not change, UK leaving the EU, less power? Power of English will grow, becomes stronger to detriment of other languages, English an important tool in the future, more used companies etc., Br and Am still the starting point</p> <p>Position of Spanish will rise, French and German more powerful in the EU? More other languages alongside English</p> <p>More focus on communication and understandability, more ‘correct’ ways of speaking, more diverse language, flexibility in understanding and using English</p> <p>GE taught more as the goal, teaching will take more ways of language use into consideration, teaching will increase a lot and start earlier, English more as the language of instruction, differentiation increases, more digital materials, robots used in communication, online teaching, international projects, opening up learning earlier, curriculum changes, export of education, English into second language and A-level language</p>

Table 4: Perceptions on the development of English in the future

These four primary themes included many ideas and perceptions generally about the development of GE and its place in the context of school. In the next section I will discuss the secondary themes mentioned earlier, which will provide more and deeper insight on specific themes in GE and education, such as teaching, awareness, materials etc.

5.2 Secondary themes

After discussing the primary themes, the secondary themes provide more insight on the perceptions the participants of this research have about GE. As mentioned before, there are a total of five secondary themes that include fewer codes but are significant enough to be their own themes. These secondary themes are called: 1) Perceptions/experiences of global English as a tool 2) perceptions/experiences of teaching global English 3) perceptions/experiences of awareness and confidence in global English 4) perceptions of global English in existing teaching materials, and 5) perceptions/experiences on pupils and their English use. These themes provide insight on the topics mentioned in the names of the themes, some of which could technically be put in some of the primary themes but upon review were significant and large enough to become their own separate themes.

5.2.1 Perceptions and experiences of global English as a tool

The first theme belonging to the secondary themes, ‘perceptions/experiences of GE as a tool’ have three level one codes: 1) GE as a tool for pupils, 2) GE as a tool for teachers and 3) Tools for GE teaching. These codes, as can be inferred by their names, discuss perceptions of GE being used as a tool by pupils, teachers and as a method of teaching, respectively. The first level one code relating to pupils divides into three additional level two codes called ‘important for pupils’, ‘a communication strategy’, and ‘interactions in class’. These codes include data such as perceptions on how GE is generally a good tool for pupils, it being important as a communication strategy, and that pupils need to hear enough so called ‘pure English’ in class.

Going from pupils to teachers, the level two codes of the second level one code are called ‘accessible material’, ‘tool for language encouragement’, ‘critical reflection’ and ‘English as a language of instruction’. These codes describe perceptions that teachers have about using GE as a tool for themselves. Examples of these codes in the data set would be that material is

easily accessible online and it should be content based, it generally helps the teacher, encourages to show language skills, provides critical reflection through research and it is a constant tool for teachers in international schools.

The third and final level one code of ‘‘tools for GE teaching’’ includes six level two codes that represent: ‘‘international research’’, ‘‘eTwinning and Erasmus +’’, ‘‘reading and listening’’, ‘‘videos’’, ‘‘non-native examples’’, and ‘‘articles and tasks’’. These codes show the perceptions that GE can be used as a tool to facilitate learning in different teaching environments. For example, GE can be used as a tool in the shape of international research outside of Finland, eTwinning, and Erasmus + that bring authenticity to learning, reading, and listening from books, searching information online, having people from different backgrounds be written by non-native speakers or people from different backgrounds and in different articles and tasks. These codes described before show the perceptions and experiences of the participants in using GE as a tool in their teaching and below you can find the table describing the theme and codes related to it.

Theme	First coding	Second coding	Examples of data
Perceptions/experiences of GE as a tool	1) GE as a tool for pupils	1) <i>Important for pupils, a communication strategy, interactions in class</i>	Communication strategy in problem situations, thinking about GE together, important to hear enough ‘‘pure English’’, pupil-pupil and pupil-teacher interactions are GE
	2) GE as a tool for teachers	2) <i>Accessible material, tool for language encouragement, critical reflection, English as language of instruction</i>	Easily accessible material, content-based material, encouraging language skills, familiarizing to diversity of language, critical reflection through research
	3) Tools for GE teaching	3) <i>International research, eTwinning and Erasmus +, reading and listening, videos, non-native examples, articles and tasks</i>	Broader research outside of Finland, eTwinning, and Erasmus+ bring authenticity to learning, reading and listening, searching information online, examples of text by people from many backgrounds, English articles and tasks on GE

Table 5: Perceptions/experiences of GE as a tool

5.2.2 Perceptions and experiences on teaching global English

The second theme of the secondary themes is related to the previous one in that they are both relevant in teaching GE. While the first theme was describing perceptions about the use of GE as a tool in teaching, the second theme describes perceptions about teaching GE itself. The level one codes of ‘‘perceptions/experiences of teaching GE’’ are as follows: 1) teacher’s motivation 2) balance with Standard English 3) teaching methods in GE, and 4) teacher’s power. These level one codes describe the perceptions the participants have about teaching GE in different ways and how the aspects of other things outside of GE affect it. The first code of ‘‘teacher’s motivation’’ includes three level two codes: ‘‘willingness to teach GE’’, ‘‘experiences abroad’’, and ‘‘focused teaching’’. These codes describe data where the participants talk about their experiences and feelings about teaching GE and being motivated to do so. Examples of data from this data set include feelings of wanting to teach GE, trying to teach diverse English, familiarising pupils to different varieties, picking up relevant language from different cultures and focusing on teaching a few varieties instead of tackling all of them. The second level one code of this theme splits into two level two themes, ‘‘need for a standard’’ and ‘‘flexibility in the standard’’. These codes discuss the perceptions of the participants where even when teaching GE, a standard is needed. One participant expresses the ideas like this:

‘‘Some sort of rules on what communicatively effective English use is must exist. Otherwise, everyone would speak it so much in their own way that in the end the language would be something other than English. It is good to have some sort of standard which is the goal, but also to accept that the perfect standardlike performance is not always possible due to background and that it is not necessary to do so either.’’

‘‘Jonkinlaiset säännöt siitä, mitä viestinnällisesti tehokas englannin kielen käyttö on, täytyy olla. Muutenhan jokainen puhuu sitä niin kovin omalla tavallaan, että se lopulta onkin kuin jotain ihan muuta kieltä kuin englantia. On kuitenkin hyvä olla jonkin standardi, jonka suuntaan pyritään, mutta hyväksytään se, ettei täydelliseen standardinmukaiseen suoritukseen aina taustatekijöistä johtuen pysty eikä tarvitsekaan pystyä.’’ – woman, age 41–50, 11–20 years of experience in elementary and lower secondary school

This reply expresses the perceptions of the need for a certain standard for English to achieve English learning and not something else entirely but at the same time understanding that accepting that the standard set cannot always be met and that the goal does not need to be met either.

The third code “teaching methods in GE” inhibit these ten level two codes: “different varieties”, “history”, searching for information”, “diversity of English”, “discussions”, “learning accents”, “visitors”, “co-operation in class”, “learning diaries”, and “presentations”. All these codes describe different teaching methods in which GE can be taught. Examples of these methods from the data set include learning about history of English, searching information about GE, discussion about the state of English and its use, visitors such as exchange students, co-operating with Finnish as a second language pupils in English if it is meaningful to do so and different learning diaries and presentations about GE. These methods are about teaching GE specifically and do not describe using GE as a tool to achieve learning in general.

The final code “Teacher’s power” spreads into four additional level two codes: “teacher’s pronunciation”, “allowance of accents”, “spread of English”, and “correctness in testing”. These codes deal with perceptions about how participants perceive teacher and their power in the use of English inside the classroom. For example, one participant expressed that she pronounces differently from the standard of the book. Other examples are explaining that English is spoken everywhere, personal accents are allowed when communicating in class, and that it is important to use correct language in tests to get full marks. These codes describe different ways in which GE can be taught and what has an impact on teaching GE in school and the table is presented below.

Theme	First coding	Second coding	Examples of data
Perceptions/experiences of teaching GE	1) Teacher's motivation 2) Balance with Standard English 3) Teaching methods in GE 4) Teacher's power	1) <i>Willingness to teach GE, experiences abroad, focused teaching</i> 2) <i>Need for a standard, flexibility in the standard</i> 3) <i>Different varieties, history, searching for information, diversity of English, Discussions, learning accents, visitors, co-operation in class, learning diaries, presentations</i> 4) <i>teacher's pronunciation, allowance of accents, spread of English, correctness in testing</i>	Teaching as a diverse language, picked up language from other cultures, focus teaching a few varieties standard required, acceptance of not achieving standard Listening to varieties, history, searching info, discussions on pupils' English uses, visits, English with S2 pupils, Learning diary, presentations Teacher speaks English differently, English spoken everywhere, own accent ok in tasks, correct language for full marks

Table 6: perceptions/experiences of teaching GE

5.2.3 Perceptions and experiences of awareness in global English

The next theme ‘perceptions/experiences of awareness and confidence in GE’ include codes that are to do with being ELF aware and how this awareness impacts the confidence in pupils. The level one codes of this theme are: 1) teaching awareness of GE 2) goals in pupil confidence, and 3) balance with traditional learning. These codes include perceptions on how awareness of GE can be taught to pupils, how to reach goals in student confidence and how to balance GE awareness teaching with the traditional methods of English teaching. The first level two codes on teaching awareness of GE are: ‘introduction of ELF principles’, ‘English in professions’, and ‘position of English’. In the data set, the participants discussed opening the term ELF to the pupils, highlighting the communicative competences and the fact that one does not need to achieve native speaker level in English. Encouraging personal accents, being aware of English

in the professional field, and thinking about the diversity of English were also mentioned in the data.

The second level one code about the goals in the confidence of pupils consists of three level two codes named ‘equality of varieties’, ‘emphasis on GE speech’, and ‘validity of ‘Finglish’’. The participants discuss these codes in the data set in many ways. For example, it was said that all variations of English are equally valuable, that their future communication will be with speakers of English that are most likely lower level than they are, intelligibility is more important than spoken grammar, that there is no wrong way to use English and that Finnishness in their speech is not an issue. One of the participants expressed the outcome of GE in terms of confidence like this when discussing the benefits of GE in school:

‘‘Only benefits. Pupils can feel encouraged to speak when they understand that they do not have to speak perfect ‘Queen’s English’ to be able to use the language.’’

‘‘Pelkkää hyötyä. Oppilaat voivat rohkaistua puhumaan kun ymmärtävät, että ei tarvitse puhua sitä täydellistä Queen’s Englishiä voidakseen käyttää kieltä.’’ – woman age 25-30, less than 5 years of experience in elementary school

In this response the participant expresses that GE is an affordance for pupils and enables them to feel more encouraged when speaking English since they do not have to worry about speaking ‘perfect Queen’s English’ or British English.

The final level one code, ‘balance with traditional learning’ has three level two codes. These codes are ‘intelligibility of speech’, ‘grammar’, and ‘slang words’. In these codes the participants perceived that even with principles of GE, complete Finnish pronunciation is unintelligible and should not be encouraged, that learning grammar is not useless and that it is important to discuss the appropriate times to use slang words in communication. These codes describe the perceptions and experiences of the participants where traditional learning is still necessary for learning. As table 7 below shows, the codes included in this theme are connected to each other, and therefore were included inside the same theme.

Theme	First coding	Second coding	Examples of data
Perceptions/experiences of awareness and confidence in GE	1) Teaching awareness of GE 2) Goals in pupil confidence 3) Balance with traditional learning	1) <i>Introduction of ELF principles, English in professions, position of English</i> 2) <i>equality of varieties, emphasis on GE speech, validity of "Finglish"</i> 3) Intelligibility of speech, grammar, slang words	<p>Opening the term ELF to pupils, highlighting communicative competences, encouraging personal accents, awareness of English in professional field, thinking about the diversity of English</p> <p>All variations equally valuable, future communication with 'lesser' skilled speakers, Intelligibility more important than grammar, no one correct way to use English, Finnishness in speech not a problem</p> <p>Complete Finnish pronunciation unintelligible, not to be encouraged, grammar not useless, discussion on appropriate times of slang word use</p>

Table 7: perceptions/experiences of awareness and confidence in GE

5.2.4 Perceptions of global English in existing teaching material

The next theme deals with teaching materials and their use in GE. This theme includes codes relating to both the positives and negatives of existing teaching materials and how they relate to stakeholders of education. The level one codes of this theme are as follows: 1) positives for GE in existing materials 2) problems with existing materials, and 3) existing materials and stakeholders. The first level one code which deals with the positives in materials has three level two codes: "GE in coursebooks", "different speakers and contexts", and "role of English".

The data describes the perceptions of participants where they express the positive aspects of the inclusion of GE in teaching materials. Examples of this data consists of perceptions such as coursebooks including other than Br and Am variations, different speakers and nationalities being included in listening material, the role of English is highlighted from an international angle, and that the speaker is not always native in the materials. One participant discussed teaching materials like this:

“Teaching materials present English language from different countries of the world, which makes it possible to talk about language as a global phenomenon.”

“Opetusmateriaalit esittelevät englannin kieltä maailman eri maista, joka mahdollistaa kielestä puhumisen globaalina ilmiönä.” – woman age 41–50, 21–30 years of experience in elementary and lower secondary school

This data shows the participants explaining that the teaching materials introduce English from different countries around the world, which enables them to discuss language as a global phenomenon. The second level one code is then the opposite of the previous one, discussing the problems with existing materials. This code splits into four level two codes: ‘‘Irrelevant content’’, ‘‘easy material’’, ‘‘native likeness’’, and ‘‘limited GE material’’. These codes describe parts of the data where the participants find issues with materials in GE teaching. Examples of this consist of data such as new books introducing irrelevant material such as using English names for people speaking English, material that is too easy for many pupils, models in speech being native like, having limited access to GE material so reliance to Br and Am material is required and that the material only scratches the surface of GE. Finally, one participant expresses the negatives of GE in materials like this:

“Hopefully all coursebooks can get other than native speakers in them in the future”

“ Toivottavasti kaikkiin kirjoihin saadaan muitakin kuin natiivipuhujia.” – woman age 41–50, 11–20 years of experience in folk school

This piece of data expresses that the participant hopes that all books would receive other than native speakers in the materials. The final code for this data, ‘‘existing materials and stakeholders’’ has one additional level two code called ‘‘stakeholders’ responsibility’’. This code describes the perceptions that the schools and coursebook makes should keep up with the developments of GE and develop books that are relevant to the current climate. This theme has many

different points of views in its codes and the entire table presenting the theme and codes can be seen below.

Theme	First coding	Second coding	Examples of data
Perceptions of GE in existing teaching materials	<p>1) Positives for GE in existing materials</p> <p>2) Problems with existing materials</p> <p>3) Existing materials and stakeholders</p>	<p>1) <i>GE in coursebooks, different speakers and contexts, role of English</i></p> <p>2) <i>Irrelevant content, easy material, native likeness, limited GE material</i></p> <p>3) <i>Stakeholders' responsibility</i></p>	<p>Diverse presentation of different variations in books, different speakers and nationalities in listening material, role of English highlighted from international angle, speaker not always native in material,</p> <p>Irrelevant material in new books, materials too easy for many, models still native-like, limited GE material, only scratches the surface of GE, need non-natives in all books,</p> <p>Schools and coursebook makers should keep up with developments of GE</p>

Table 8: perceptions of GE in existing teaching materials

5.2.5 Perceptions on pupils and their English use

The final secondary theme discusses the perceptions and experiences on pupils and their English use. The codes related to this theme discuss both the learning and usage of pupils' English.

The four level one codes of this theme are: 1) English use outside of school 2) English learning outside of school 3) pupils' positive perceptions of English, and 4) Pupils' negative perceptions of English.

The first code discussing English use outside of school includes four level two codes: 'outside communication in English', 'ownership of English', 'background of pupils', and 'English from media'. These codes describe data that discusses the ways pupils use English outside of school. For example, most communication by pupils is with non-native speakers, many pupils speak English with non-natives while gaming, they take ownership of English through online use, the diverse backgrounds of pupils and learning English from peers and online were discussed as relevant aspects of pupils' English use outside of school.

The second code describes English learning outside of school and it consists of two level two codes called 'learning from outside of school' and 'English at home'. The participants describe situations such as pupils hearing English during free time increasingly often, that they learn English with little effort and that English as a home language influences their English learning.

The next code discusses the positive perceptions that pupils have towards English. This code divides into two level two codes: 'motivation to learn' and 'understanding of intelligibility'. The data set shows that the participants perceive these as pupils being very motivated to learn English and that some pupils understand that the most important thing in communication is to be understood. The final level one code is the opposite, the negative perceptions that pupils have towards English. This code divides into four level two codes, so two more than the previous one: 'challenge of learning', 'perceptions on Br and Am English', 'confidence of students', and 'learning in school'. These codes consist of data such as pupils being disappointed that English in school is not as easy as they thought, pupils' perceptions that Br and Am English are the only two options, that other varieties than Am English are odd, higher education students being shy about speaking in their own accents, and pupils' attitudes where they think nothing new is learned in school and that they know enough by themselves. These codes provide different insight on how pupils use and perceive English from the point of view of the teachers. As the table below shows and this description explains, there are many ways how pupils of different ages perceive their use of English.

Theme	First coding	Second coding	Examples of data
Perceptions on pupils and their English use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) English use outside of school 2) English learning outside of school 3) Pupils' positive perceptions of English 4) Pupils' negative perceptions of English 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>Outside communication in English, ownership of English, background of pupils, English from media</i> 2) <i>Learning from outside of school, English at home</i> 3) <i>Motivation to learn, understanding of intelligibility</i> 4) <i>Challenge of learning, perceptions on Br and Am English, Confidence of students, learning in school</i> 	<p>Most communication by pupils with non-native speakers, spoken English with non-natives while gaming, ownership of English through online use, diverse backgrounds of pupils, English from peers and online</p> <p>Pupils will hear and learn English during free more, learning English with little effort, English as a home language influences learning</p> <p>Pupils very motivated to learn, 7th graders: most important to be understood</p> <p>Disappointment that English in school not as easy as online, perceptions that English is spoken in UK and USA and these are the options, Am English the norm and other varieties odd, students (high education) shy to speak with their accents, pupils know enough without school teaching</p>

Table 9: perceptions/experiences on pupils and their English use

These secondary themes provide a more detailed view on the perceptions and experiences that English teachers have about GE in the school context and as a phenomenon. They provide many different views about the topic even inside individual themes. In the next section these different

views on both in the primary themes and secondary themes will be discussed in both when comparing the data sets with each other and how this data can be explained by the theory presented in this thesis. Some personal opinions and analysis about the data will also be presented.

6 Discussion

In this section of the thesis, I will discuss the results of the study and how the nine different themes found in the study relate to the theory of the thesis. Some comparison and analysis will be conducted at the same time, focusing on how the theory and results interact with each other. In this section the reliability and relevance of the study will also be discussed, and as the final part conclusions and future implications from this study will also be addressed.

6.1 Implications of the results

The nine themes that were found in the study included four primary themes about GE as a phenomenon, the positives, and negatives of GE in school and the future of English, and five secondary themes about GE as a tool, teaching GE, awareness and confidence in GE, GE in existing teaching materials and pupils' and their English use. The primary themes show the general perceptions and experiences of teachers while the secondary themes provide a more detailed view on specific topics.

The first primary theme shows that Finnish English teachers are very aware of the existence of GE or ELF. From the codes of this theme, it can be surmised that teachers understand the general goals and ideas of the ELF phenomenon, highlighting the importance of communication and understandability, which are the foundation of ELF as a phenomenon (Kiczowski & Lowe, 2019). The teachers also show understanding of the backgrounds of the global spread of English by discussing the influence of both British and American English. This, as said by Crystal (2003) and Schneider (2006) has been an important factor in the globalization of English. The term European English was also brought up by the participants of the study, just as Kachru and Smith (2008) discuss how Europe has different variations on how English is spoken. The importance of English in the professional field, everyday life and academia was also discussed, showing that Finnish English teachers show awareness of the importance of English use in the modern global world and that knowing and understanding different Englishes is very important in the current world, as discussed previously (Kiczowski & Lowe, 2019). This also means that understanding many different Englishes is more important in communication than knowing perfect Standard English, as previous research has shown (Smith & Rafiqzad, 1979; Smith & Nelson, 2006). Some of the participants showed their knowledge on the topic by discussing how their personal theses or studies have dealt with the phenomenon of GE, so their awareness of the subject is clear.

The second primary theme dealing with the positives of GE in school showed many ways in which GE can be a positive force in the school context. Teachers saw that GE provides motivation to many students in using and learning English through searching for more information and providing feelings of success for pupils. This shows that teachers think that the ELF phenomenon is a positive force in learner motivation and that speaking GE will provide necessary feelings of success to pupils who may not get them from trying to use Standard English. GE was also seen to be useful in normal schoolwork, such as writing, reading and comprehension. According to the participants GE provides meaningful and realistic environments for language use and learning and that it is very important for tolerance and openness in the classroom. These responses show the awareness that the teachers have on GE and its possibilities in positive outcomes in classroom use. These intercultural competences are important to be taught as well as creating an environment where the norm of speaking English is not dictated by British or American English (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2019). These intercultural competences and ideas are also relevant for the codes that had to do with classroom environment. Teachers brought up how using GE will increase feelings of belonging in the classroom and how pupils' personal accents would be more accepted in a GE environment, showing the teachers' competence in being aware of the emotional impacts that their teaching will have on the pupils and how GE will help mitigate the uneasiness pupils may feel during English class.

The third primary theme discusses the negatives of the GE phenomenon in school. It should be noted at the beginning of this that while there were many negative codes found in the study, the overall amount of them were lower than the positives. The participants found many different issues that could arise from GE while still being positive about the phenomenon. The negative aspects of GE that were expressed by the participants had to do with subjects like difficulties in teaching GE, confusion of pupils, lack of structure, negative attitudes of both pupils and teachers, issues with school, ignorance of GE completely and the power of English. Many of the negative thoughts relating these topics have to do with issues while using GE as the only way of English teaching, where no structure is given and no basis for learning is introduced. These perceptions in my opinion show that the teachers who participated in this research support using GE as a part of their current English teaching, with still conforming to some standard from Standard English. This follows Kohn's (2018) ideas that ELF and EFL do not have to be used separately but rather together as a unit that support each other. The issues relating to this theme deal mostly with the dichotomy between ELF and EFL, and as the participants have expressed in earlier and upcoming themes, using ELF in a meaningful way is the way they feel

it can be most useful for both teachers and pupils. Also, as Kiczkowiak and Lowe (2019) discussed, it is the teacher's responsibility to raise awareness of ELF for pupils, meaning that the way in which this is addressed in the classroom is also up to the teacher. The negative attitudes of pupils could possibly be solved by discussing ELF awareness and showing that even when using GE, complete lack of proper pronunciation is not the goal either.

The final primary theme discussing the development of English in the future showed wide topics and ideas from the participants. Development of English as a global language, languages other than English, English communication, and English teaching were all perceptions and ideas that came up. Crystal (2003) has said that English will become more and more important on the global scale, and in the year 2020 we know this to be true. Teachers today feel the same still as well, according to this research. Teachers seem to feel that global aspects of English will become more common in the future and teaching will also move towards a more global perspective. Finnish English teachers feel that ELF principles and teaching them will be more and more important in the future, while also showing ideas of other languages possibly rising due to the UK leaving the EU for example. The fears of these other language losing power was also brought up in the previous primary theme. As Seidlhofer and Breiteneder (2006) discussed the need for Europe to develop some sort of system to both conserve its multilingualism and promote the global use of English in international communication. Finnish teachers share this feeling of the need to preserve other languages as well. Communication and teaching of English will develop mostly towards ELF principles, according to the participants. These include ideas of more focus on authentic language use, more focus on communication and teaching GE as the goal more in school. English teaching will also begin earlier and become more GE focused earlier than before. This is showing already in Finland, with some schools starting English on the first grade in some form already. The overall perceptions on the future of English are therefore the continuation of the rise of English use around the world, while also giving some space to other languages. Finally, communication and teaching of English will also grow towards ELF principles and focus more on authenticity instead of becoming a native-like speaker.

Moving on to the secondary themes, first one of them being GE as a tool, teachers had a few perspectives. According to the participants GE can be used as a tool by both pupils and teachers and it can also be useful as a tool for teaching. GE as a tool for pupils was a good as communication strategy. This coincides with the ideas of Mustanoja et al (2017) who discussed English used as a resource for learning. As mentioned in previous section, ELF can be used as a good resource in foreign language learning and the perceptions that come up with this research also

agree with this idea. In terms of GE as a tool for the teacher and teaching, many different things could be done. The participants expressed that GE can be used to look for material and ideas from online source, like international research as suggested by Llurda and Mocanu (2018). Kemaloglu-Er and Bayyurt (2018) presented different explicit ways to use GE as a tool, and many of the same ways were present in the results of this study.

The next secondary theme describes teaching GE. The participants brought up four themes about teacher motivation, balance with SE, teaching methods in GE and the teacher's power. These codes that were created coincide with previous theory through awareness of ELF and the motivation of being ELF-aware brings out (Kiczowskiak & Lowe, 2019). The methods that the participants discussed in the data also fit both the explicit and implicit ways of ELF-awareness teaching (Kemaloglu-Er & Bayyurt, 2018). Teacher's power and how the teacher shows through discussion and action demonstrates the ideas of Kohn's (2018) social constructivist ideas where the pupils have the power to set their own goals in language learning through becoming aware of their options and possibilities. Overall, the data shows that teachers are aware of many different GE teaching methods and other aspects that relate to teaching GE, which in turn shows as overall positive attitude towards GE in school. The Finnish core curriculum also probably has an impact on the many ways in which teachers see English teaching and GE in teaching due to its broadness and the different possibilities it provides to teachers (Opetushallitus, 2014).

In terms of the theme of awareness and confidence in GE, the teachers had many ideas in teaching GE-awareness, goals in pupil confidence and how to balance these with traditional learning. As previously said by Kiczowskiak and Lowe (2019), teachers are responsible for teaching awareness of ELF to the pupils. The participants of this study seem to agree with other previous studies such as Fushino's (2010) where confidence in language skills increase the participation of the pupils in the class. This is achieved by teacher through promoting the equality of varieties, emphasising GE speech, and showing that "Finglish" is a valid variety of speech as well. As can be seen, these perceptions on confidence are highly linked to the ELF paradigm and principles through awareness. But as also stated by Kiczowskiak and Lowe (2019), and what is also present in the data of this research, this does not mean that complete lack of structure is required. As an example, the participants discussed the complete Finnish pronunciation of English words, which is not the goal of neither ELF nor EFL teaching.

The secondary theme discussing teaching materials showed interesting results. Ideas for both positive things and negative things about existing teaching materials were present in the data. Some expressed that the material was diverse and introduced different varieties and contexts, while others expressed the lack of GE material and the necessity to use Br and Am examples. As Tantiranat and Fay (2018) suggest, finding ways to use existing materials and the ELF-aware materials while supplementing it with other material where the books lack. The participants finding the necessary material in their books and materials in general may feel that the amount they find in them is enough for it to be sufficient and they can use other material to fill in the gaps left by the existing material. On the other hand, the teachers who felt that there was not enough of existing material may feel that the need to go outside of the material and look for new material is enough to show the lack of proper GE material in teaching. Some teachers may also act like suggested by Siqueira and Matos (2018) and use ELF-aware experimental activities in traditional textbooks to promote ELF. These very differing ideas in the data could very much come down to personal opinions on what is enough to constitute as GE material rich textbook. When it comes to the code regarding stakeholders in the data, Sougari (2018) discussed that some issues in implementing ELF in teaching can come from the stakeholders, which were mentioned in this research to also have the responsibility to follow the trends of ELF. This calls for more co-operation between schools and teachers to bring awareness to the need of GE materials in teaching.

The final secondary theme regarded the use of English by pupils. This data showed that teachers know pupils and their habits of English use outside of the school. Both the use and learning outside of the school came up in the data. The many ways in which pupils use English and take ownership of it follow the ideas of Kohn (2018) where pupils should push themselves to learn English in normal communication settings outside of the school as well. Taking ownership is also a very important aspect in becoming an ELF-aware and proficient speaker (Kohn, 2018). The participants also discussed the positive and negative perceptions that pupils may have in using English. These positive ideas come from the motivation of the pupils, which can be assumed to originate from the use of English outside of the school. This is how I personally became interested in learning English as well. The negative issues come from both the lack of confidence and the feelings of overconfidence as well. The lack of confidence shows in the shyness of students even in higher education, as was presented in the data. Park and Lee (2006) discussed that the lack of confidence in language use usually means worse results in testing as well, which makes it an easy slope to slide down lower and lower. Some of the students are not

aware of ELF and feel the need to know either Br or Am English to be understood, which we know is not the case. Therefore, teaching ELF-awareness is key. This theme shows excellently the different points of view pupils may have about English and shows teachers where some of the issues may lie.

The results in all nine of these themes presented and analysed earlier can prove very useful for teachers and people interested in language learning in general. The perspectives, ideas, experiences and even some contradictions the data showed can be used to further the study of ELF in the school context in many ways. The next section will discuss this research in terms of its reliability and replicability and the final section will discuss conclusions and further research opportunities that this thesis provided.

6.2 Reliability

Reliability and replicability are always something that is asked when a research is conducted. In terms of replicability in phenomenography, original finding of categories of description is also a form of discovery and these discoveries do not need to be replicable (Marton, Sherman & Webb, 1986). This means that the themes and codes discovered in this specific data set do not need to be exactly replicable, as they have been discovered for the first time from this specific data set. Considering the participants and the data created from the participants, it would be easy to assume though, that if someone else were to conduct a similar study with this same data, it would very likely produce similar results. It should be noted that the participants for this study were mainly from a Facebook group of over 4000 people, with a few singular participants from outside of said group, that the perceptions and experiences found in this research do not necessarily reflect those of the entire group. The participants of this research are probably teachers how are interested in topics related to ELF, which would incline them to participate more. This does not influence the reliability of the research though, since the research outlines that they were all familiar with the topic when presenting the participants.

According to Silverman (2017) reliability means the degree of consistency with which instances are placed to the same category be either different observers or by the same one on different situations. He also mentions that to be able to create reliability in a research, the procedure and categories used must be consistent. One should not also come to conclusion before going through the data carefully (Silverman, 2017). According to these principles, I conclude that the

research conducted in this thesis is reliable. If these methods were to be used in different situations, similar results could be achieved. The research procedure and categorization through different themes were consistent through the research process and based on relevant methodologies and methods of analysis. A lot of time was also used for the analysis of the data. During the process I read through the data multiple times, and once again after every level of coding that was conducted to the data. during the creation of the themes and codes, a lot of time was spent on reviewing them to make them as meaningful as possible. Reviewing themes is an important part of thematic analysis, which made focusing on it easier (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The amount of different data that was collected from the questionnaires also speaks in favor of the reliability of this research. Many different perceptions and experiences were expressed in the data, showing that the point of view of phenomenography was very suitable for this thesis. Using thematic analysis to complement phenomenography provided a clear and structured way of presenting the results. However, what can be said, is that the personal ideas and feelings towards this topic may have had an impact on the way this research was conducted. My personal interpretations of the data may slightly differ from another person's interpretations. This is the case with any research in all fields of academia though. As a result, I find no major issues in reliability in this research.

6.3 Conclusions

David Crystal (2003) presented surveys done in 1995 with over 1400 replies, that English would become a major language that people are learning and that it will increase in the next 25 years. The survey also concluded that English will remain as the dominant language and it will be essential for progress because it provides the means to access high-tech communication and information and lastly, that English will remain as the world's languages for international communication for the coming 25 years. As 25 years have passed from the time these surveys were conducted, these assumptions were indeed correct. English has become the most global and used language in the world that is learned by millions of people around the world to be able to communicate internationally online and in person. The results of the research done in this thesis supports these ideas as well.

There are many conclusions that can be made from this research. First, the two research questions of the thesis were certainly answered. As a reminder the two research questions were:

1. How do English teachers in Finland perceive and/or experience English as a global language as a phenomenon in general and in the context of school?
2. How do teachers perceive the future of English as a global language and how the role of English will change?

The first and main research question of the research was answered by the themes created from the data set, showing the many ways in which ELF has landed into the field of education from teachers' point of view. According to this research, Finnish English teachers are aware and knowledgeable on the phenomenon of ELF. They also show awareness of different ways in which ELF or in the context of the research, GE, can have positive impacts in the context of school. These positive perceptions and experiences include topics like motivation, meaningfulness, impact on real life, multiculturalism, tolerance, and the respect of others. Teachers themselves also see GE as a positive force in the field of education. The negative perceptions that teachers had were related to problems relating to differentiation and weaker pupils, and the possible confusion of having multiple varieties in school. The problems in teaching purely GE were also brought up, showing that teachers prefer to complement their traditional methods with GE methods instead of completely changing their ways of teaching. Concerns for the rising power of English was also brought up, and the complete ignorance of GE from the stakeholders' part was an issue that can have a negative impact on GE teaching in school.

Teachers are also aware of different ways in which GE can be used as a tool by both teachers and students, and how it can be used as a meaningful teaching tool. Teachers are also aware on the different ways in which GE can be thought and have had different positive teaching experiences. These ideas include the need for standard and implementation of ELF methods instead of complete replacement. Teachers also had many perspectives on specific teaching methods in which GE can be used in and how they can use their personal power as teachers to promote the positive aspects of ELF. Experiences and perceptions on the importance of GE awareness was also discussed. Teaching this awareness, having goals for pupils' rise of confidence and balancing these ideas with the traditional models of speech and pronunciation were important.

The most division in the perspectives and experiences came from the existing teaching materials. Many teachers found the existing materials to be suitable and enough for teaching ELF, but many also expressed the limitation and small amount of said material. Teachers therefore have different ideas on what is enough in terms of ELF in existing materials. Difference in course-books may also play a part in the different perspectives on this topic. Teachers also showed

perspectives on their pupils and their use of English, acknowledging that pupils learn and use a lot of English outside of the school for different reasons and may have both positive and negative perceptions on the language based on their experiences. Some may feel like their skills are not good enough and be reluctant to use it and some may feel that their English is good enough and school does not add anything to their English use.

The second research question shows that the ideas that Crystal (2003) presented in the survey that was conducted 25 years ago is still relevant today. Teachers today have very similar ideas and perspectives in the future of English. They felt that the power of English will rise or stay the same, while other languages may or may not grow beside it. Communication and teaching will move towards a more global, ELF based perspective, where authentic and communication-based speech is valued more and more. Teaching will follow a similar path, starting earlier and increasing the use of technology in language learning as well. Educational changes will happen in a large scale according to teachers.

In short, Finnish English teachers are generally positive about the phenomenon of ELF both in general and in school, while wanting to add teaching methods promoting the global role of English into their current teaching without completely replacing what was before. Teaching how to use ELF as a tool, teaching awareness of ELF, using meaningful teaching materials, and promoting the positive aspects of ELF-based language learning are how teachers experience ELF in school. Learning English as a global language will be important in the future for them and the perspectives of the teachers reflect that. In terms of future research that can be conducted based on this research, investigating new curriculum coursebooks could be an interesting topic. The differences in perspectives of the teachers in this research begs the question, are these differences due to the different opinions of the teachers, or the differences in the quality of the teaching materials? The latest core curriculum promotes many of the ideas of ELF, so having coursebooks and materials that reflect these ideas is important (Opetushallitus, 2014). Another interesting avenue of research could be the experiences and perceptions of pupils. We saw how the teachers perceive the English use of pupils, but is that the whole story? There are both teachers and pupils in the school, so having the point of views from both sides will be important if we want to improve our language teaching for the better. Other contexts of English use in and outside of Finland should be investigated even more to learn more about the phenomenon of English as a lingua franca in different communicative contexts. English as a lingua franca could be a major key in the future of English teaching and it would be important to treat it as a part of modern linguistic competence. As Kiczkowiak and Lowe cleverly put it:

“ELF is not a theoretical chimera thought up in the fertile imaginations of applied linguistics but, rather, a real and important phenomenon that has numerous practical implications for the teaching of English” (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2018, p. 13)

It seems that Finnish English teachers have generally understood the importance and the place of English as a lingua franca in their teaching contexts. Finland has been an example of great education, so showing the way in modern communication based English teaching would be fitting for the Finnish education system. We know that English will not be moving from the position of the number one global language for a long time. Preparing pupils for the inevitable future of modern global world is the number one job of a teacher. Teaching English as a lingua franca as a part of language teaching seems like the best place to start.

References

- Aalto, E. & Tarnanen, M. (2015). Kielitietoinen aineenopetus opettajankoulutuksessa. In Kalliokoski, J. Mård-Miettinen, K. Nikula, T. (Eds.). *Kieli koulutuksen resurssina: vieraalla ja toisella kielellä oppimisen ja opetuksen näkökulmia*. AFinLA-e. Soveltavan kielitieteen tutkimuksia 2015. 8. (pp. 72–90).
- Ahlholm, M. (2015). Englanti venäjänkielisen alakoululaisen suomen kielen oppimisen tukena. In Kalliokoski, J. Mård-Miettinen & K. Nikula, T. (Eds.). *Kieli koulutuksen resurssina: vieraalla ja toisella kielellä oppimisen ja opetuksen näkökulmia*. AFinLA-e. Soveltavan kielitieteen tutkimuksia 2015. 8. (pp. 93–112).
- Albl-Mikasa, M. (2013). Express-ability in ELF communication. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*. 2(1). 1–122.
- Ahonen, S. (1994). Fenomenografinen tutkimus. In Syrjälä, L. Ahonen, S. Syrjäläinen, E. & Saari, S. (Eds.). *Laadullisen tutkimuksen työtapoja*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä Oy.
- Awan, R-N. Azher, M. Anwar, M. N. & Naz, A. (2010). An investigation of foreign language classroom anxiety and its relationship with students' achievement. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*. 7(11). 33–40.
- Baumgardner, R. J. (2006). Teaching World Englishes. In Kachru B. B. Kachru Y. & Nelson, C. L. (Eds.). *The handbook of world Englishes*. (pp. 661–679). Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- Bhatia, T. K. (2006). World Englishes and Global Advertising. In Kachru B. B. Kachru Y. & Nelson, C. L. (Eds.). *The handbook of world Englishes*. (pp 386–401). Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. Vol. 3(2). 77–101. doi: [10.1191/1478088706qp063oa](https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa)
- Brown, K. (2006) Models, Methods, and Curriculum for ELT Preparation. In Kachru B. B. Kachru Y. & Nelson, C. L. (Eds.). *The handbook of world Englishes*. (pp. 680–693). Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- Cossham, A. F. (2017). An evaluation of phenomenography. *Library and Information Research*. 41(125).
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language (2. ed.)*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, D. (2005). *Varieties of modern English: An introduction*. Harlow: Longman.

- Deniz, E. B. Öskan, Y. & Bayyurt, Y. (2016). English as a Lingua Franca: Reflections on ELF-Related Issues by Pre-Service English Language Teachers in Turkey. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*. 16(2). 144-161.
- Dewey, M. & Patsko, L. (2018). ELF and teacher education. In Jenkins, J. Baker, W. & Dewey, M. (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*. (pp. 441–455). Routledge.
- Elder, C. & Davies, A. (2006). Assessing English as a Lingua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 26. 282–301. New York. Cambridge University Press.
- Fang, F. (2016). ‘Mind your local accent’: Does accent training resonate to college students’ English use? *Englishes in Practice*. 3(1). 1–28.
- Fang, F. (2017). English as a Lingua Franca: Implications for Pedagogy and Assessment. *TEFLIN Journal*. 28(1) 57–70.
- Firth, A. (1996). The Discursive accomplishment of normality: On ‘Lingua Franca’ English and conversation Analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 26(2). 237–259.
- Fushino, K. (2010). Causal relationships between communication confidence, beliefs about group work, and willingness to communicate in foreign language group work. *TESOL*. Tokyo.
- Ghonsooly, B. Hosseini Fatemi, A. & Khajavy, G.A. (2014). Examining the relationships between willingness to communicate in English, communication confidence, and classroom environment. *International Journal of Research Studies in Educational Technology*. 3, 63–71.
- Heimonen, E. & Ylönen, S. (2017). Monikielisyyys vai ”English only”? Yliopistojen henkilökunnan asenteet eri kielten käyttöä kohtaan akateemisissa ympäristöissä. In Latomaa, S. Luukka, E. & Lilja, N. (Eds.). *Kielitietoisuus eriarvoistuvassa yhteiskunnassa – Language awareness in an increasingly unequal society*. AFinLAn vuosikirja 2017. Suomen Soveltava kielitieteen julkaisuja. 75. (pp. 72–91). Jyväskylä.
- Hult, F. M. (2017). More than a lingua franca: Functions of English in a globalised educational language policy. *Language, culture and curriculum*. 30(3). 265–282. Routledge.
- Häkkinen, K. (1996). *Fenomenografisen tutkimuksen juuria etsimässä: Teoreettinen katsaus fenomenografisen tutkimuksen lähtökohtiin*. University of Jyväskylä. Hetimonex Oy.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The Phonology of English as an International Language: New models, new forms, new goals*. Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*. 28(2). 1-207.

- Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a Lingua Franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*. 66(4). Oxford University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In Quirk, R. & Widdowson, H. G. (Eds.). *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*. (pp. 11–30). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (2006). World Englishes and Culture Wars. In Kachru, B. B. Kachru, Y. & Nelson, C. L. (Eds.). *The handbook of world Englishes*. (pp. 446–471). Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- Kachru, Y. & Smith, L. E. (2008). *Cultures, contexts, and world Englishes*. New York: Routledge.
- Kemaloglu-Er, & E. Bayyurt, Y. (2018). ELF-awareness in Teaching and Teacher Education: Explicit and Implicit Ways of Integrating ELF into the English Language Classroom. In Sifakis, N. C. & Tsantila, N. (Eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*. (pp. 159–174). Multilingual Matters.
- Kiczowski, M. & Lowe, R. J. (2019). *Teaching English as a lingua franca: The journey from EFL to ELF*. Delta Publishing.
- King, R. D. (2006a). The Beginnings. In Kachru, B. B. Kachru, Y. & Nelson, C. L. (Eds.). *The handbook of world Englishes*. (pp. 17–269). Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- King, R. D. (2006b). First steps: Wales and Ireland. In Kachru, B. B. Kachru, Y. & Nelson, C. L. (Eds.). *The handbook of world Englishes*. (pp. 17–269). Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- Kohn, K. (2011). English as a lingua franca and the Standard English misunderstanding. In De Hower, A. & Wilton, A. (Eds.). *English in Europe Today. Sociocultural and Educational Perspectives*. (pp. 71–94). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kohn, K. (2015). A pedagogical space for ELF in the English classroom. In Bayyurt, Y. & Akcan, S. (Eds.). *Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for ELF*. (pp. 51–67). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Guyter.
- Kohn, K. (2018). Towards the reconciliation of ELF and EFL: Theoretical issues and pedagogical challenges. In Sifakis, N. C. & Tsantila, N. (Eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*. (pp. 32–44). Multilingual Matters.
- Kordia, S. (2018). ELF-aware Teaching in Practice: A Teacher's Perspective. In Sifakis, N. C. & Tsantila, N. (Eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*. (pp. 53–71). Multilingual Matters.

- Koskela, H. (2008). That was smooth and fast: Kannanotot englanninkielisissä urheiluhaastatteluissa. In Leppänen, S. Nikula, T. & Kääntä, L. (Eds.). *Kolmas kotimainen: Lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa*. (pp. 332–254). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Kouvou, A. & Tsagari, D. (2018). Towards an ELF-aware ALternative Assessment Paradigm in EFL Contexts. In Sifakis, N. C. & Tsantila, N. (Eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts eds.* (pp. 227–246). Multilingual Matters.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The Decolonial Option in English Teaching: Can the Subaltern Act? *TESOL Quarterly*. 50(1). 66–85.
- Kääntä, L. (2008). Opettajan arvioivat vuorot oppilaiden toiminnan ohjailemisen keinoina englanninkielisessä aineenopetuksessa. In Leppänen, S. Nikula, T. & Kääntä, L. (Eds.). *Kolmas kotimainen: Lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa*. (pp. 73–106). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Kääntä, L. (2017). In search of proper pronunciation students' practices of soliciting help during read-aloud. In Kuronen, M. Lintunen, P. & Nieminen, T. (Eds.). *Näkökulmia toisen kielen puheeseen – Insights into second language speech*. AFinLA-e. Soveltavan kielitieteen tutkimuksia 2017. 10. (pp. 61–81).
- Leppänen, S. & Nikula, T. (2008). Johdanto. In Leppänen, S. Nikula, T. & Kääntä, L. (Eds.). *Kolmas kotimainen: Lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa*. (pp. 9–40). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education, a user's guide 3rd edition*. California, United States of America. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Llurda, E. & Mocanu, V. (2018). Changing Teachers' Attitudes Towards ELF. In Sifakis, N. C. & Tsantila, N. (Eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*. (pp. 162–177). Multilingual Matters.
- Lopriore, L. & Vettorel, P. (2018). Perspectives in WE- and ELF-informed ELT Materials in Teacher Education. In Sifakis, N. C. & Tsantila, N. (Eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*. (pp. 97–116). Multilingual Matters.
- Martin, E. A. (2006). World Englishes in the Media. In Kachru B. B. Kachru Y. & Nelson, C. L. (Eds.). *The handbook of world Englishes*. (pp. 583–600). Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- Mäntylä, K. & Kalaja, P. (2017). ”Unelmieni oppitunti” englannin kielen opettajakoulutettavien visualisoimana. In Latomaa, S. Luukka, E. & Lilja, N. (Eds.). *Kielitietoisuus eriarvoistuvassa yhteiskunnassa – Language awareness in an increasingly*

- unequal society*. AFinLAn vuosikirja 2017. Suomen Soveltava kielitieteen julkaisuja. 75. (pp. 201–218). Jyväskylä.
- Mustanoja, L. Tervola, M. Sandberg, K. & O'Dell, M. (2017). Kielen resurssit ja yhteiskunnallinen eriarvoistuminen. In Latomaa, S. Luukka, E. & Lilja, N. (Eds.). *Kielitietoisuus eriarvoistuvassa yhteiskunnassa – Language awareness in an increasingly unequal society*. AFinLAn vuosikirja 2017. Suomen Soveltava kielitieteen julkaisuja. 75. (pp. 161–180). Jyväskylä.
- Nikula, T. (2008). Oppilaiden osallistuminen luokkahuonevuorovaikutukseen englanninkielisessä aineenopetuksessa. In Leppänen, S. Nikula, T. & Kääntä, L. (Eds.). *Kolmas kotimainen: Lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa*. (pp. 42–72). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Nikula, T. (2015). Ainekohtaisen kielen käyttö ja oppimisen mahdollisuudet CLIL-tuntien tehtäväpohjaisissa tilanteissa. In Kalliokoski, J. Mård-Miettinen K. & Nikula, T. (Eds.). *Kieli koulutuksen resurssina: vieraalla ja toisella kielellä oppimisen ja opetuksen näkökulmia*. AFinLA-e. Soveltavan kielitieteen tutkimuksia 2015. 8. (pp. 15–33).
- Niikko, A. (2003). *Fenomenografia kasvatustieteellisessä tutkimuksessa*. Joensuu. Joensuun yliopisto.
- Opetushallitus. (2014). *Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2014*. Helsinki. Next Print Oy.
- Paakkinen, T. (2008). "Coolia" englantia suomalaisissa mainoksissa. In Leppänen, S. Nikula, T. & Kääntä, L. (Eds.). *Kolmas kotimainen: Lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa*. (pp. 299–329). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Park, H. Lee, A.R. (2006). *L2 Learners Anxiety, Self Confidence and Oral Performance*.
- Peltonen, P. (2017). L2 fluency in spoken interaction: a case study on the use of other-repetitions and collaborative completions. In Kuronen, M. Lintunen, P. & Nieminen, T. (Eds.). *Näkökulmia toisen kielen puheeseen – Insights into second language speech*. AFinLA-e. Soveltavan kielitieteen tutkimuksia 2017. 10. (pp. 118–138).
- Pennycook, A. (2007). The myth of English as an International Language. In Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (Eds.). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. (pp. 90–115). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pickering, L. (2006). Current Research on Intelligibility in English as a Lingua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 26. 219–233. New York. Cambridge University Press.

- Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2008). Koodinvaihto kontekstivihjeenä videopelitulanteissa. In Leppänen, S. Nikula, & T. Kääntä, L. (Eds.). *Kolmas kotimainen: Lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa*. (pp. 136–168). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Pitkänen-Huhta, A. (2008). Kielellinen leikkittely oppilaiden teksteihin liittyvissä keskusteluissa. In Leppänen, S. Nikula, T. & Kääntä, L. (Eds.). *Kolmas kotimainen: Lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa*. (pp. 107–135). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Rapley, T. (2016). *Some Pragmatics of Qualitative Data Analysis*. In Silverman, D. (Ed.). *Qualitative research (4th edition)*. (pp. 429–462). London. SAGE Publications.
- Roiha, A. (2017). CLIL-opetuksen merkitys elämäntietojen rakentajana: kahden entisen oppilaan pohdintoja. In Latomaa, S. Luukka, E. & Lilja, N. (Eds.). *Kielitietoisuus eriarvoistuvassa yhteiskunnassa – Language awareness in an increasingly unequal society*. AFinLAN vuosikirja. Suomen soveltavan kielitieteen yhdistyksen julkaisuja. 75. (pp. 257–277). Jyväskylä.
- Schneider, E. W. (2006). English in North America. In Kachru B. B. Kachru Y. & Nelson, C. L. (Eds.). *The handbook of world Englishes*. (pp. 17–269). Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- Seidlhofer, B. Breiteneder, A. & Pitzl, M-L. (2006). English as a Lingua Franca in Europe: Challenges for Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 26. 3–34. New York. Cambridge University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. & Widdowson, H. (2018). ELF for EFL: A change of subject? In Sifakis, N. C., & Tsantila, N. (Eds.). *English as a lingua franca for EFL contexts*. (pp. 17–31). Multilingual Matters.
- Sifakis, N.C. (2014). ELF awareness as an opportunity of change: A transformative perspective for ESOL teacher education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*. 3(2). 317–335.
- Sifakis, N.C. & Bayyurt, Y. (2015). Insights from ELF and WE in teacher training in Greece and Turkey. *World Englishes*. 34(3). 155–484.
- Sifakis, N. C. & Tsantila, N. (2018). Introduction. *English as a lingua franca for EFL contexts*. (pp. 1–16). Multilingual Matters.
- Silverman, D. (2017). *Doing qualitative research (fifth edition)*. Los Angeles. SAGE Publications.
- Siqueira, S. & Matos, J. V. G. (2018). ELT Materials for Basic Education in Brazil: Has the Time for an ELF-aware Practice Arrived? In Sifakis, N. C. & Tsantila, N. (Eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*. (pp. 132–156). Multilingual Matters.

- Smith, L. E. & Nelson, C. L. (2006). World Englishes and Issues of Intelligibility. In Kachru B. B. Kachru Y. & Nelson, C. L. (Eds.). *The handbook of world Englishes*. (pp. 428–445). Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- Smith, L. E. & Rafiqzad, K. (1979). English for Cross-Cultural Communication: The Question of Intelligibility. *TESOL Quarterly*. 13(3). 371–380.
- Sougari, A-M. (2018). Exploring Teachers' Sense of Efficacy in Teaching ELF. In Sifakis, N. C. & Tsantila, N. (Eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*. (pp. 192–208). Multilingual Matters.
- Tantiniranat, S. & Fay, R. (2018). Developing an ELF-aware Intercultural Purpose in the Thai University Context. In Sifakis, N. C. & Tsantila, N. (Eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*. (pp. 72–92). Multilingual Matters.
- Unver, M.M. (2017). The use of authentic materials with low-level learners of English. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*. 2.
- Valentine, T. M. (2006). World Englishes and Gender Identities. In Kachru B. B. Kachru Y. & Nelson, C. L. (Eds.). *The handbook of world Englishes*. (pp. 567–580). Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- Virkkula, T. (2008). Työntekijöiden kokemuksia englannista yritysmaailman kielenä. In Leppänen, S. Nikula, T. & Kääntä, L. (Eds.). *Kolmas kotimainen: Lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa*. (pp. 382–420). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2012). ELF and EFL: what's the difference? Comments on Michael Swan. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*. 2(1). 187–193.
- Zoghbor, W. (2011). *The effectiveness of the Lingua Franca Core (LFC) in Improving the Perceived Intelligibility and Perceived Comprehensibility of Arab Learners at Post-Secondary Level*. University of Leicester. ira.le.ac.uk/handle/2381/9635